the conference committee. The conference committee worked since March of this year in good faith to deal with the pension crisis, and they added to that package the so-called extenders, those tax provisions that are about to expire that are critically important to the country. We were prepared to pass that package. The leaders from the conference on the other side decided, no, they didn't want to have that discussion in the public. Instead they didn't appear, and they hatched this other plan to have a pension bill come out of the House freestanding and this other package that includes elimination of the estate tax and an increase in the minimum wage for some States.

I was with the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, who informed me in her State the so-called minimum wage increase will actually reduce the minimum wage for millions of workers because of its provisions. They put together the Abandoned Mine Lands Act in this package in order to try to get the support of Members here, and they have wrapped it all in a big package to try to get this body to do something that makes absolutely no sense for the fiscal future of this country. That is, without question, the most irresponsible package I have seen offered here in my 20 years in the Senate. It is not just a little bit irresponsible; it is wildly irresponsible. This is reckless, the course this country is being taken on, utterly reckless.

Why do I say that? Because sometimes you wonder if anybody is paying attention. Here is what is happening to the debt of our Nation: $5.8 trillion in 2001; $8.5 trillion at the end of this year. If the budget the President proposed is followed, the debt will rise to $11.5 trillion in 2011. If this proposal is adopted, it will be even worse. From 2012 to 2021, this proposal that is before the body will take another $750 billion and add that to the amount this country will have to borrow. It is unbelievable.

This President has taken us on a reckless course. Forty-two Presidents took 224 years to run up a trillion dollars of our debt held abroad. This President has more than doubled that amount in only 5 years.

So what is before the body now? A plan to go out and put another $750 billion on the charge card, because this money has to be made up from somewhere. We can't pay our bills now. If you reduce the revenue that is scheduled to come in, the debt goes up. You have to have more borrowing, more going to the Chinese, more going to the Japanese, and asking them for more money. How are we going to pay it back?

Our friends say this is a tax cut. I don't think so. I think what this is an enormous tax shift. Because at some point we are going to have to start paying our bills. And when we do, I have a feeling I know what they are going to do. They are going to come out here and they are going to say: All of us have to contribute. All of us have to participate. We are going to have to cut spending. We are going to have to raise revenue.

I can see their proposal now. They will be coming right at the middle-class people who are the bulwark of this economy. They will either cut programs that are important to them, such as Social Security and Medicare, or they will raise taxes on them, all so that we could give a big reduction to the very wealthiest among us, the people who have benefitted most from the genius of the American economy.

Many of the wealthiest people I know say: Don't do it in my name. Don't do that in my name. I don't need another tax cut. I do need a country that pays its bills. I do need a country that isn't borrowing more and more money from China and Japan and Great Britain and Mexico.

I can't think of a more consequential fiscal decision that will be made than this one. Are we going to keep digging the hole deeper and deeper? Or are we going to head in a new direction and get serious about getting America back on track?

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, in response to my friend from North Dakota, I would note that the difference between the position he articulates—and it is a position a lot of people in Washington hold—and the position that a lot of the rest of us hold is between those who worry a lot about how much money the Government has versus those of us who think it is a better idea to let people keep more of what they earn, that they are probably in a better position to make good judgments about how that money should be spent, and especially when it comes to their death and their loved ones who have to face the difficult choice of deciding how to pay the death tax that, unless something is done, is going to go up to effectively 60 percent. Can anybody imagine a 60-percent tax rate? It is actually on the books at 55 percent, but because of the way the Code works, it can be as much as 60 percent. Can you imagine a 55-percent or 60-percent tax rate? You cannot pay it unless you sell the farm or sell the business. I know people to whom that has applied. So it is a difference between those who worry how much money Washington has and those of us who are concerned about people keeping more of what they earn.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VITTER).

GULF OF MEXICO SECURITY ACT OF 2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I note that the next Democratic speaker after me will be Senator HARKIN, and the next Democratic speaker after Senator HARKIN will be Senator SCHUMER.

We are now in the final days and hours of this session of Congress. One of the bills that is circling, waiting for a place to land is the pension bill. We now know the pension bill has been passed by the House, and it is waiting to be taken up in the Senate, but we don't know when it is going to be taken up. It all depends on what we do about the estate tax.

The pension bill—the bipartisan pension bill—must not become a pawn in the debate over other unrelated issues. This bill needs to pass, and it needs to pass this week. There is only one reason it is being held up: politics, politics, politics.

The pension bill is being used as a pawn for reckless tax breaks for a few when the pension bill will help the many. We need to move this pension bill. I urge the Republican leadership to bring up the bill this week and to bring it up before any tax bill. The American people need it. We need to protect the pensions of millions of Americans, we need to provide relief and certainty to good-guy businesses, and we need to protect the taxpayers from having billions of dollars dumped on the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. Promises made should be promises kept.

America's pension system is in crisis. There are companies that are declaring bankruptcy and then dumping their pension plans on the taxpayers. We have the legislative framework to deal with this.

We have had terrible problems. Bethlehem Steel didn't honor their books and declared bankruptcy. They dumped the pensions of 100,000 workers and retirees on the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. United Airlines declared bankruptcy in 2002 and dumped the pensions of 122,000 workers on the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation.

One might say: What will this bill do? It will help to make sure that history does not repeat itself. I have been fighting alongside my colleagues for a long time to enact comprehensive, bipartisan reform. Senator DEWINE and I held hearings over a year ago. The Senate passed its bill 7½ months ago. There was a HELP Committee bill and a Finance Committee bill.

When we were waiting to pass the bill, Senator DEWINE and I had a hold on it because we were concerned that it would place at risk certain come-back companies that were working their way out of bankruptcy and would force their pensions into junk bond status.

We had the assurances of our colleagues, Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS from the Finance Committee, saying: Lift your hold. We need to pass the pension bill. We will work with you.

So Senator DEWINE and I trusted Senators BAUCUS and GRASSLEY, and we did work it out. We were able to agree within the Senate on a bipartisan framework. Then we took it to the House conferees. It was a rocking-and-rolling conference but, again, we were able to get it done.

Now, why can't we get the bill done in the Senate? We worked it out in conference, and it passed the House. Why can't it pass the Senate? It needs to pass the Senate by Thursday or Friday. Now is the time to pass the bill.

The Republican leadership has decided that protecting a few zillionaires' estates after they die is more important than protecting pensions for retirees while they are still alive. Let's get our priorities straight. We are not only talking about the retirees who depend on us, we have workers right now in airlines who are wondering what is going to happen to them. What do you say to somebody who is working for an airline who might lose his pension? Think about that mechanic. Think about what he is concerned about.

What about the stewardesses, the brave people we saluted on flight 93? The last thing we can do is honor their memory and have a pension bill for those who fly every single day.

What about the people who are working right now who are concerned that the rules of the game will be shifted on them? Our pension bill—our bipartisan pension bill—will protect them.

We really have to pass this bill. I urge the Republican leader to bring up the pension bill after we dispose of this coastal drilling issue. As I said, the time for delay is over, the time for politics is over, and it is time for us to take up and pass the pension bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006, and I also rise to put its provisions in perspective and to dispel some of the myths and simple inaccuracies that, unfortunately, have been propagated in many places, including on the Senate floor.

It is important to understand what this important Energy bill does because it does do significant and important things, and it is also important to understand what this bill does not do because it does not do several things that opponents have claimed. So let's go down these two simple lists.

This Energy Security Act does many important things. It brings new sources of domestic energy to the market over the next few years. All of us should agree that is a very important and necessary component of securing our energy future—not the only component, not the only thing we must do but a very important component of what we must do.

This bill generates new revenue for the U.S. Treasury. There has been enormous misinformation about that. There have been claims that the producing States are somehow raiding the Federal Treasury. What the States are doing is producing more Federal revenue for the Federal Treasury. If that is a raid, let the raids begin, and we will soon erase the deficit.

This bill promotes parity with nearly 90 years of onshore energy production policy by recognizing the importance of reinvesting in our offshore energy-producing areas to ensure the sustainability and liability of domestic energy production and independence.

For decades and decades, producing States onshore, on Federal land, have shared 50 percent of the royalty produced on those Federal lands. This begins to achieve some parity with that by allowing coastal producing States 37.5 percent.

This provides dedicated revenue streams for the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That fund makes grants available to all of our States for 50 percent of the costs of parks, soccer fields, and other recreational opportunities.

This fully complies with the budget resolution we passed last year and the reserve fund amendment I included in the Senate's budget resolution this year, and it all reduces America's dependence on volatile foreign energy sources.

Those are all very important goals. Those are all goals achieved by this bill.

Just as importantly, there are many things this bill does not do which opponents have confused in the debate.

This bill does not in any way affect offshore California, the west coast, the Northeast, or anywhere on the east coast. This bill is focused on the Gulf of Mexico and has the support of the Senators from all of those Gulf Coast States.

This bill does not change offshore policy in any area other than the Gulf of Mexico, which today provides up to 30 percent of our energy.

This bill does not raid the Federal Treasury of funds from current revenue streams. It does not increase the deficit. As I said, what this bill does is the opposite. It allows production activity which would not occur otherwise. What does that mean? That means increased Federal revenue—$1 billion toward deficit reduction—not decreased Federal revenue.

This bill does not provide funds for the expansion of Federal land acquisition programs through the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I find, quite frankly, the opposition to this bill enormously frustrating. So many of these same Members of the Senate—others in the broader debate—are some of the loudest voices about high, increasing energy prices, oil prices at the pump, natural gas prices and what that does to our competitiveness. I agree with those concerns. Those are very legitimate concerns. Yet we bring a bill to the floor of the Senate that can absolutely have a short-term impact, a positive impact, bringing prices down, and, no, they have to oppose it. That is not good. That cannot be part of the solution.

The cost of natural gas has increased 400 percent over the last several years. Natural gas is a mostly continental commodity. Its importation through LNG is possible, but that alone cannot have enough of an impact to bring down prices the way we want to see them come down. So we need to produce more domestically. This bill will do that and help bring down natural gas prices.

Gasoline prices have increased from $1.28 in 1996 to over $3.60 in some areas of the country today. Of course, these surges were exacerbated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

These huge spikes don't impact us just at the gas pump or when we pay our heating and cooling bill. They affect us everywhere—at the grocery store, when we buy clothes, at the hardware store, the airlines when we go on trips, restaurants when they pay higher energy bills, and also in the job picture. When we decry jobs moving overseas, high natural gas prices in this country are a huge factor, particularly in select industries such as our chemical industry.

Yet, again, the folks who run to the floor of the Senate to beat on these issues and try to take advantage of them politically the most are among those who are opposing this bill. It makes no sense to me, and it is enormously frustrating to me.

They also seem to be opposed to this bill because they are just opposed on virtual religious grounds on more oil and gas production.

We need to do a lot of things to secure our energy future, and certainly that involves research and new technology and new forms of energy. But as we do that—and we are doing that, and we will do more, and we must do more—as we do that, the fact is, for the next several years and several decades we will have an economy in some ways dominated by oil and gas.

So if we want to give consumers relief, if we want to secure our energy independence in the short term, we also at the same time need to attack that side of the question, and this bill does that, domestically increasing our independence.

It is just completely irresponsible for people to say we can't address that side of the equation. We must, as we must address the longer-term side of the equation, with new technology, new sources of energy, new science and engineering. Those both have to be necessary components of a solution.

I would have a little more sympathy with some of these arguments if Senators from many of these other States, not in the directly affected region in the gulf, were producing at least other forms of energy. They don't like oil? They don't like natural gas? There are other things folks in different parts of the country can do. There is nuclear. There is solar. There is windpower. The fact is, so many of the critics from these other places do not contribute to the Nation's energy needs in any of these categories.

The Department of Energy has some interesting statistics. State by State, what does a State consume in energy and what does it produce? California consumes eight times more energy than it produces. Massachusetts is the winner. It consumes 65 times more energy than it produces. Florida consumes 11 times more energy than it produces.

This is not being part of the solution. This is not sustainable. It is particularly ironic when some voices from these very same places decry a bill as we have on the floor which can be part of the solution, which can lower energy prices even in the short term and can get us to the longer term as we transition to new energy sources.

Finally, as I mentioned, there is a whole myth that many of these same opponents bring up that somehow we are raiding the Federal Treasury. If bringing in more Federal revenue is raiding the Federal Treasury, then let the raid begin. That is what this bill does. It increases Federal revenue—$1 billion more for the Federal Treasury, $1 billion more of deficit reduction. That is the plain and simple fact. Why is that? Because this bill expands production which expands revenue which, even in the new rules of revenue sharing under this bill, increases Federal revenue and decreases the deficit.

For any opponents to claim that this somehow increases the deficit and raids the Federal Treasury is simply untrue. It is factually incorrect. There is more Federal revenue, bringing down the deficit.

S. 3711 is positive. It is concrete, it is taking action now. It is a step forward. It can have an impact that can make life better for average Americans, even in the short term, and help bring down energy prices, help increase our energy independence, help produce new revenue, not just to the producing States; but also to the Federal Treasury—help reduce the Federal deficit.

This is a win-win-win-win, and I urge my colleagues to support this important energy legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak in opposition to the so-called Energy bill that we have before us, on which we will be voting cloture later this afternoon. I want to make my position very clear. I am certainly not against drilling for oil and gas here in the United States or in the Gulf of Mexico. Fossil fuels are an essential component of our Nation's energy infrastructure, and I support appropriate steps to build our supply and use. For example, I have repeatedly, for several years, called for the construction of the Alaskan natural gas pipeline. I voted for last year's Energy bill which contained numerous incentives and provisions for the development of fossil fuels. In fact, I voted for previous Energy bills over the past several years.

However, unlike those previous Energy bills, the bill before us today is not comprehensive. Far from it; it is a narrow bill, focused strictly on drilling for oil and gas in certain portions of the Gulf of Mexico. There simply is not that much gas being made available under this bill.

I mentioned a moment ago the Alaska natural gas pipeline. Every day, they are reinjecting into the ground gas already discovered in Alaska that could be shipped to the lower 48 if we had a pipeline in place. In fact, if we had started on this several years ago we would just about be completed with that pipeline right now. The pipeline is projected to provide some 2.2 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable gas each year for the next 100 years. But the bill before us today would provide perhaps 5 or so trillion cubic feet lasting less than 3 years.

What does that all mean? It means there is about 40 times the amount of natural gas in Alaska than we would ever get from this bill before us in the Gulf of Mexico. That may not even be including the Mackenzie gas bill in Canada.

The Minerals Management Service indicates the gas made available under the bill before us, if you project 50 years into the future, could be about 2½ months of supply. In other words, of all the natural gas we are going to need for the next 50 years, the bill before us will provide about 2½ months of supply. Over the next 15 years—another way of looking at it—we get about 9 days' worth. And we won't get any at all until 2012. This is not going to have any significant impact on our supply.

As Senator BINGAMAN noted, in order to get access to this very modest amount of gas—as I said, perhaps 5 trillion cubic feet—we are locking away 21 trillion cubic feet in the eastern gulf until 2022 by placing these areas under a 16-year moratorium. What a deal for the American consumer. What a deal. We can get 5 trillion cubic feet, but in exchange for that we are going to lock away, for 16 years, up to 21 trillion cubic feet that could be made available in the eastern gulf. That is not a very good deal for the American consumer.

I think the better bet is for Congress to find a way to get the Alaska natural gas pipeline built. Yet we have done nothing on that. Unfortunately, key parties in the State of Alaska are not getting the job done, and we have not done anything to really move them in that direction. My understanding is that the legislature there is not satisfied with the concurrent contract proposal negotiated by the Governor, and he is not satisfied with them. It goes back and forth and back and forth.

Earlier this year, Senator SNOWE and I wrote a letter to the Energy Committee asking them to investigate this and hopefully to come up with some suggestions so that in some way we here in Congress might break that logjam.

Anyway, there is little hope for them getting it settled by the end of the year, but we are focusing on this—5 trillion cubic feet, when we have 40 times that amount in Alaska that could be piped down. That is just one facet of how bad this bill is.

Second, this drilling legislation would drain the Federal Treasury of billions of dollars in lost revenue that would otherwise be available for urgent national priorities—priorities, I might add, such as agricultural and rural development assistance, health care and education, in addition, of course, to real energy security.

I know a number of farm groups—my farmers—need more natural gas. We use it to make fertilizer. We use a lot of it to make ethanol, also. The point here being that the amount of money we are going to lose under this bill means that we are going to be draining money away from the Federal Treasury that we will need in the next farm bill, which is coming up, which we are going to need for a safety net for farmers, which we are going to need for conservation payments, which we are going to need to provide more incentives for ethanol and biodiesel and biomass production.

Again, the offset is not good. Agriculture really comes up a loser.

The reason I say that—one other bad facet of this bill is that it provides 37.5 percent of the revenue from the new leases in areas beyond their areas to four Gulf Coast States. In other words, four States are going to get 37.5 percent of all the revenues from gas and oil that is way, way beyond their territorial waters.

I can't blame my friends from those States for fighting hard for this bill. I can't blame the Senators from Texas and Louisiana and Mississippi and Alabama—they are making out. This is a heck of a deal for them. Like I said, I can't blame them, but what about the rest of the Senators here? We represent other States.

This is not unique. This came up once before back in 1952, when the President of the United States was Harry S Truman, from Missouri. The issue again was, to whom do these minerals, oil and gas, in the Gulf of Mexico belong? I want to read this for the RECORD. Here is what a courageous, gutsy President had to say:

> The minerals that lie under the sea off the coast of this country belong to the Federal Government—that is, to all the people of this country. The ownership has been affirmed and reaffirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States . . .

I am quoting Harry Truman. He said:

If we back down on our determination to hold these rights for all the people, we will act to rob them of this great national asset. That is just what the oil lobby wants. They want us to turn the vast treasure over to a handful of States, where the powerful oil interests hope to exploit it to suit themselves.

Talk about corruption. Talk about stealing from the people. That would be robbery in broad daylight—on a colossal scale. It would make Teapot Dome look like small change.

I got a letter from a fellow in Texas today, who is a friend of mine, and he was weeping over what the schoolchildren of Texas were going to lose if Texas didn't get its oil lands 9 miles out from the shore.

Nine miles. Here we are talking about 100 miles, and more. This was 9 miles. Listen to what Truman was saying about the oil and the gas 9 miles off the shore:

And I composed a letter to him, and then didn't send it. I said what about the schoolchildren in Missouri and Colorado, and North Dakota and Minnesota and Tennessee and Kentucky and Illinois, do they have any interest in this at all? Evidently not, it should all go to Texas. Well, it isn't going there, if I can help it.

Boy, why don't we have a President like that today? Talk about telling it like it is. And Truman did veto it.

Here is his closing.

I can see how the Members of Congress from Texas and California and Louisiana might like to have all the offshore oil for their States. But I certainly can't understand how Members of Congress from the other 45 States can vote to give away the interest the people of their own States have in this tremendous asset. It's just over my head and beyond me how any interior Senator or Congressman could vote to give that asset away. I am still puzzled about it. As far as I am concerned, I intend to stand up and fight to protect the people's interest in this matter.

President Harry Truman, May 17, 1952.

Where is Truman when we need him today? Yet we read history and look back and say: Boy, that Truman, he was brave, he was courageous, he fought for real people. He was on our side. How, he said, can Members of Congress from other States—Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, Illinois—how can they vote for something like this to give away a national asset to four States? Truman said it in 1952. Here we are back again, back again.

As I said, 37.5 percent goes to these four States. As Truman said—how did he say it? He said here, ''Talk about corruption. Talk about stealing from the people. That would be robbery in broad daylight—on a colossal scale. It would make Teapot Dome look like small change.''

Truman had it right then. He is right today, too.

Another reason to be opposed to this bill is it is such a narrow and controversial bill when we consider the components of what we really need for a 21st century sustainable energy policy for our Nation. By that I mean an aggressive and continuing effort to promote conservation and to ramp up renewable energy. It is as true today as it was 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and 30 years ago. It is cheaper right now to conserve a barrel of oil or a trillion cubic feet of natural gas than it is to go out and drill for it. It is easier and cheaper—cheaper to conserve. Yet we have this bill before us, this very narrow bill, very contentious bill, that gives all this—37.5 percent of these royalties—to these four States.

You might say the average American out there listening to this debate would say: HARKIN, why don't you amend it? If you feel so strongly about this, offer an amendment; see what happens.

Guess what. We can't offer any amendments. Yes, that is right. You may wonder, Is this the Senate? You mean we can't offer an amendment? That is right. I cannot offer an amendment to this bill because of the games the leader on the other side played in terms of how he brought it up under cloture and filled the tree, as they say. That is just gobbledygook, meaning the majority leader is able to engineer the way the bill is brought up so we cannot offer amendments to it. When the bill comes up for a vote, it is up or down. We can't even offer an amendment. We can't offer an amendment on conservation or renewable energy or to say maybe it shouldn't be 37.5 percent for four States, and maybe other States something else. Fifty amendments were filed on this bill. None of them will be considered.

We have time to talk for days around here about flag desecration and about gay marriage. I am not saying those aren't important issues. But let's get real, folks. We are talking about something here that affects every American every day. People are hurting out there with an unusually hot summer. People are struggling to pay these big gasoline prices—upwards of about close to $3 a gallon, 71 cents more than a year ago. Natural gas prices are the highest of anywhere in the world right here in America. Yet how do we go about achieving some energy price relief for my Iowans or other Americans? How do we go about it?

We have this bill—this very narrow bill. We should be discussing other parts of what we need for energy. The Senate leaders, Senator FRIST and Senator REID, were asking last week that we include a period for energy debate while addressing the measure before us. Again, we spent all this time this year debating this and that. And if we have time for those, we surely have time to debate America's energy security challenges, offer our amendments, debate them, and let's see what comes out of the process.

I filed two amendments to this bill. One contains the Biofuels Security Act. It is a bipartisan measure to improve our ability to deliver renewable fuels to motoring consumers. I am not going to explain every little bit of it, but basically it would increase the amount of renewable fuels we make.

Second, it would make E–85 ethanol available at gas stations across America.

Third, it would require the automobile companies to make more flexible fuel cars such as they are doing in Brazil right now so we could have E–85 pumps across America.

I filed a second amendment that would require the EPA to adjust the fuels standards to meet a 10 billion gallon target by 2010. That shouldn't be too much. We are going to meet that, anyway. We should do it higher.

We need to spur growth of cellulosic biofuel production—fuels made from fibrous materials such as corn stover, wheat straw, wood waste and switchgrass.

Lastly, in terms of conservation, I cosponsored an amendment with Senator OBAMA and others to increase vehicle fuel economy standards for the first time in two decades. Imagine that. We have not increased fuel standards in this country in 20 years. Yet here is a bill on energy and we can't amend it.

Conservation of energy coupled with increased availability of renewable fuels is the pathway to the future while at the same time doing what we can to increase our natural gas production.

The best thing would be the pipeline from Alaska.

As I said, I am not opposed to drilling for gas and oil in the gulf, but I am the way this bill is set up. If you do not have a component in the bill for renewable energy production, biomass, biofuels, wind energy for electricity and others, photovoltaics as a component of it, and also conservation, all this bill says is basically we are going to continue to do what we have been doing in the past—getting more fossil fuels. We may need fossil fuels, but the sad truth is that this bill before us is a missed opportunity to do big things for our energy future and our energy security.

Again, I assume that the votes are cut and dry on this the way they have it. I just want to make sure people know we can't offer amendments. We are being precluded from doing so. But hopefully we will be back and hopefully we can have a more serious discussion and debate about how we provide for America's energy security in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, would my colleague yield for a brief question?

Mr. LOTT. I would be happy to yield, without losing the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Does the Senator know how long he will speak?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate, I must say I never know how long I am going to speak. I will not speak that long, but I may get excited and go a little longer. My guess is not more than 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak immediately after the Senator from Mississippi finishes his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise to speak on this very important legislation, S. 3711. But like others today, I may decide I need to comment on some other issues that will be discussed later on this week.

First, I must say that this week I have been thinking repeatedly about that great line from Rudyard Kipling's ''If.'' ''If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you''—

And it goes on. It is a great poem, it says that if you keep your head when everybody else around you is losing theirs, you shall inherit the Earth, my son.

That is what I would encourage my colleagues to do today. Let's keep cool. Let's not lose our heads. Every one of us is going to get up to speak, and there is going to be somebody on the other side of the issue or on the other side of the aisle who is going to say, That Senator lost his head. Let's keep our cool.

I just heard a speech saying we shouldn't pass this bill because it is not big enough. Yet you are going to hear a speech later this week saying we shouldn't pass one of the next bills because it is too comprehensive.

This is not a bill that is going to solve all of our energy needs. This energy problem has not developed in the past year, or 10, or 20, or 30. It has been coming for years. We have made speeches on this floor about how we are becoming more and more dependent on foreign oil. We were all worried that it would go up to 40 percent, then 50 percent, and now it is 60 percent. If we don't do anything about it, it is going to continue to go up.

Do I think it is dangerous? Yes. I believe we should address it in every way we can.

As I have said before in some of my speeches here, I personally believe that the way to deal with our energy needs is to produce more of everything—make the pie bigger; quit trying to find ways to shrink it; more gas production; more clean coal technology; more hydrogen plants; more nuclear plants; and, yes, alternative fuels—biomass, bio-diesel, conservation; the whole package.

In my opinion, the first option has always been to produce more. That is the way I was raised. You do not have to do with less. You can find more natural resources, you can find more alternative fuels, and we ought to try to do that. I think we can get together on this.

As far as I am concerned this is not a comprehensive package, we passed a big energy bill last year, a very costly bill, with several good provisions in it.

This very morning I met with people saying they were interested in several tax credits. They said they could change automobiles so they could work using propane. We have the infrastructure to do this. There are lots of good ideas out there. We are going to have our first ethanol plant in Mississippi. We are all trying to find a way to do a better job.

This bill will also help our new ethanol plant. It will produce lots more oil and gas, millions of barrels of oil, and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas. Why shouldn't we do that? Because it does not include all the coasts or all kinds of other resources? That is not good enough.

This bill is a step in the right direction. It will lead us toward more production which will make us less dependent on foreign oil. Why don't we do that? It will have an impact pretty quickly. It will have an impact on the futures markets. I think we can get some of that oil and gas out of the Gulf of Mexico in this designated area sooner than a lot of people think, and in larger quantities.

I urge my colleagues to quit trying to find the perfect. This is good enough. This is a magnificent effort, and it is bipartisan.

I talked to my friend, former Senator John Breaux of Louisiana, a Democrat, this morning. I said, We finally figured out how to bring together a bipartisan package without you. Twenty-two Democrats voted to move to this legislation yesterday. Seventy-two Members of the Senate said let's cut out the frivolous debate, and let's go to the substance here. This is an opportunity to get something done.

Why are we whining about it? Why aren't we high-fiving and congratulating each other and saying to the American people that it is not the end but it is a beginning? It is good. Let's do that. We need to address this overall energy problem.

I have heard some other interesting opposing ideas to this bill. One of them is: Well, if we do this, it will be cutting revenue coming to the Federal Government. Let's see. The math on that one eludes me. If we don't do this, we are not going to get any revenue from this area—none, zero.

If we do it, we will have a substantial impact on the Federal budget with revenue coming in. Yes, some of it will go to the States in the region and some of it will go to States all over the country. However, there will be a huge impact on revenue coming in from the royalties if we pass S. 3711, to open up millions of acres in the south central part of the Gulf of Mexico.

This, once again from the standpoint of helping the Government and the people, is a winner because revenue will also be coming into the Federal Treasury.

Some have argued: Why should the States in the area benefit? We should benefit because we haven't benefitted in the past; because we have not been treated fairly; because we are the ones who take the risks. We are the ones who have a tremendous coastal impact problem which we must now address: hurricane prevention, protection and coastal replenishment. We have estuaries in Louisiana that are disappearing. We have a huge problem on our hands. With the revenue from offshore drilling we can pay for it. We are taking the risks, therefore we should have the benefits. At least some benefit. These risks may be very minimal, but we need the revenue to take care of ourselves.

I like the fact that not all of the revenue from this area goes to the Gulf States or the Governors. It goes to the local people. Twenty percent will go to the local people, the supervisors. The individual counties will decide what part of preservation, restoration, prevention, or recovery they will put this revenue into.

For years, the royalties from on shore exploration in the West stayed within the States where drilling was taking place. They got 50 percent of it. Yet, in the Gulf where oil and gas exploration has taken place for years, we have been getting zero except for the tiny percentage we got out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Basically nothing.

Now we would like to have something similar to what they've had out West. However, we are not saying that it all either has to go to the states or to the Federal Treasury. Part of the revenue will go to the Gulf States, part of it will be going to the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, which will go to States all over the Nation, and part will go to the Federal Treasury. For the first time, the Gulf of Mexico States would be getting a fair deal. I am proud of that. All of us from that region—Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—are supporting this package.

Without us, it probably wouldn't have happened. A lot of credit goes to the Senators from the region, particularly the Senators from Louisiana, MARY LANDRIEU and DAVID VITTER.

This is also an acceptable arrangement for Florida, which has not been easy. It has been tedious. They want to protect the area that is used for military training. They want to protect their beaches, which are crucial to their tourism. I understand that. I may not agree with them in terms of how far away it has to be, but they believe this is a fair agreement for their state.

That was not easy to achieve. It has taken a lot of time and effort. It is a principled one, from an economical, energy security and environmental standpoint.

All of this drilling will not take place unless it is at least 100 miles from our coast, or 125 miles away from the Florida shore.

By the way, back in the real world, China is prepared to start drilling off the coast of Cuba, which is within 60 miles of Florida. Is that going to happen? Yes. Yet we are prohibiting the drilling for the gulf oil and gas even 125 miles away for the Coast of Florida. This legislation is a good effort. I am proud to be part of it.

Let me speak a little bit about this week. Colleagues, there will be plenty of time and plenty of opportunity to say: It is your fault, it is this leadership, that leadership, it is Democrats, Republicans, it is this chairman, it is the House of Representatives; recriminations, blame all over the place. We need to put aside the blame game. We need to put aside our own pitiful pride, where we are defending our turf, insisting on the correctness of our position.

If it were my call, I wouldn't set this week up the way it is, but someone has to make that call, and it has been made and I support it. This could be an incredibly good week. If anyone thinks we are going to do better in the elections this year by doing nothing, you are sadly mistaken. Does anyone around here not see where Congress is rated? Between the two parties, it is a question of who is the lowest, not who is the highest.

We need to produce. We used to be able to do that. We used to be able to reach across the aisle and find a way to make it happen. That is what we need to do this week. Envision this: Dream that at the end of this week we will have passed an energy bill that will help reduce our dependence on foreign oil; we will have passed a defense appropriations bill that will help us in the war on terror, and support our troops wherever they stand vigil this very night; we will have passed pension reform that has been years in coming that is in the best interest of corporations and employees all over this country, that is good for aviation and automobile manufacturers, but most importantly of all, working people, people out there making it all happen, people who are worried about their retirement, worried whether their pensions will be there, will it be at the level they were promised? What will it be? How can you transition from defined benefits into defined contributions, 401(K) plans, IRAs? They would sleep better if this dream came through and we finished this week up passing this pension reform with the aviation pension part of it included. And the so-called trifecta.

I don't know much about betting. I must admit that I don't even know what a trifecta is, but I know it is three of something. I suspect that in a trifecta bet the return on a dollar is huge. That is what will happen if we pass this bill.

It has a minimum wage increase, $2.10 over the next 3 years. A lot of small business men and women are concerned about that. How will they cope with that? Will they take it out of the bottom line? Will they lay off people? Will they raise their prices? They are not sure, but the fact is we have not passed a minimum wage increase in 10 years. I was here when that happened. There are a lot of people who feel it is time we do this. We can debate that. We will debate that. But if we are going to get a trifecta, that is part one.

Part two is extenders. That is more Senate talk in Washington for tax provisions, but they are not just insignificant tax provisions; they are the tax credit for research and development, which is about the future of America. If we want to be competitive, we better be doing research and development because the Chinese, the Japanese, even the Russians are beginning to do things in that area.

It has a deduction for college tuition. I thought we were for that. For the first time we are on the verge of getting a fair capital gains rate for timber. I thought we were for that. That part of the trifecta has so many things that will be beneficial for working men and women of America, the people who own a few acres of timberland, for people who want to send their kids to school. We need it. It will produce I don't know how much more revenue than would be expended in tax credits or deductions. You never get finished reaping the benefits of helping your kid go to college and getting an education. It benefits the revenue of our Federal Treasury for years to come. I am one of those. I had a school loan to get through college. I paid it back a few times over through the years. So we ought to do the extenders.

We ought to do a reasonable compromise on the death tax. We will hear ranting and raving about how horrible it is that we would reduce taxes on the wealthy. I am not one of those. I don't have anyone in my blood family who will qualify. I do have a couple of in-laws who would probably qualify for it. But I have never been able to conceive but one other tax worse than the death tax. Just the idea that you work all your life, you produce, you save, you have a house, a farm, a small business, whatever, and the Government shows up when you die and says, give me a huge chunk of it—the principle is wrong. I have never talked to men, women, young or old, all kinds of different races, who say the death tax is a good idea. That is a bad idea. The only tax I know that is worse is the income tax, of course, and the day will come when we will have to fix that, too.

Can I argue about parts of it? Sure. Can I argue against some of the things in the death tax and the minimum wage and how it is constructed? Sure. But is it good enough? Will it help America? Yes.

We can have a vision this week that leads us to do these four things and leave here on a high note. That would be good for America and good for everyone who participated in the effort.

I urge my colleagues to keep calm this week. Let's hold down on accusations. Let's try not to get mad at each other. Let's try to cooperate as much as we can between our leadership. Let's see if we can't do something right for a change in this institution.

I still have faith that the majority of the Senate wants to do what is right for our country, not what is right for our party or our region to the disadvantage of other regions, and certainly not what we are told by our leadership.

Sometimes we do not agree with our leadership, but these guys and ladies have a very tough time. They have to review a lot of things the rest of us don't know about. We have to be prepared to follow. This week they may be pulling against each other, but maybe we can help get them back together and produce a final product.

I would like to urge my colleagues to vote for S. 3711. In fact, I suggest that we vote for everything this week. That would be novel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, by unanimous consent I understand the Senator from New York has reserved the time coming up. I visited with him. He needed to attend a meeting, so I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed, to be followed by Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi counseled me to stay calm. I am a reasonably calm guy. I don't get too excited about much of anything—at least that is what my wife would suggest. But let me tell you something that happened to me last night that caused me to be a little less than calm.

I drove, like most Americans, to a gas station. I pulled up to the pump, I swiped my credit card, and $39 later I filled an economy car full of $3.25 per gallon gas.

I must tell you and tell the Senator from Mississippi, I wasn't calm. This Scotchman's blood began to rile a bit when I realized that I and all other Americans are paying more for their gas today than ever in the history of this country and it is Government policy that caused it.

It is an attitude over the last 20 years that somehow America was going to conserve its way out of this problem. We didn't have to produce, we didn't have to refine, and, by the way, you can go out and buy a bigger car and it will burn a little more, but don't worry about it, it will be there. We lulled ourselves into this sense of false security that somehow gas is always going to stay at $1.25 or $2 a gallon.

While we were in a sense of false security, we did something else that was politically stupid. Where the greatest potential for domestic oil production exists today, we said take it out of bounds, take it offline. Seventy-five percent of the Outer Continental coast of America today, where our greatest reserves exist, is off limits, all in the name of the environment, even though we have applied technology, science, and engineering in a way today that was proven during the tremendous storm of Katrina when we knocked thousands of wells offline in the gulf, and not one drop of oil was spilled.

Why, then, did we do this all in the name of the environment if, in fact, we can retrieve oil from our deep waters off the Continental Shelf and coast today and not damage the environment? It was the politics of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s. During that time, not only was gas relatively inexpensive compared to today's prices, but our consumption levels went up and we began to buy more and more oil from foreign supplies, foreign producers, dominantly from the Middle East but some from Central and Latin America.

Today, with all of these red areas off limits, where there are potentially billions of barrels of oil, we said ''no'' and we find ourselves dependent today with speculative oil prices going through the roof because wars are being fought, people are killing people in one of the most insecure areas of the world, an area we have grown to become dependent on for the supply of our primary economic resource, oil. What is wrong with that picture, America?

Pogo once said: I have found the enemy and the enemy is us. Maybe that is to paraphrase it a little bit. The enemy for oil prices is us, if I can say it in those terms. It is not only public policy in America today that has created the ''no'' zone to production, it is the attitude in America that somehow energy prices are always going to stay inexpensive and we don't have to produce anymore, even though our rate of consumption continues to grow.

Then along come the late 1990s and the early 2000s and the Chinese economy takes off, the European economy takes off, and the Indian economy takes off, and they are now all large consumers of oil. We all buy it from the same pool, and the price goes up.

Today, before the Senate, this afternoon at 5 o'clock, we have an opportunity to begin to slowly but surely correct a very big problem we built up in the decades of the 1970s, the 1980s, and 1990s, a self-inflicted wound we can now bind up and heal while we work our way out from increasing dependence on foreign resources. That legislation is S. 3711.

What does it do? It takes us right down here to this tiny little green square in the Gulf of Mexico called lease sale 181.

We say to the oil companies of America: You can go out there and bid and lease and drill. Our geological survey determines that there are trillions of cubic feet of gas out there and, potentially, billions of barrels of oil. We can bring it on line and send it to our gulf coast refineries and begin to process it and move it into our distribution systems. And for a moment in time we will become just a little less dependent on Saudi Arabia or Iraq or anywhere else in the world in which we are buying oil today.

Why did we do it? Times change. Attitudes shift. Technology changes. Today, there is absolutely no reason to have a no-zone around the United States because we not only can produce it, we can do it in an environmentally sound way. Here is what we believe—not me; we, the U.S. Geological Survey, our Federal agencies that study where our oil reserves and potentials are—here is what they say we can do. They say there are, potentially, in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge—2,200 little acres that we can drill out of millions of acres—potentially, tens of billions of barrels of oil up there; and in the OCS, 115 billion barrels of oil, of which this one little spot down in the gulf we call lease sale 181 that is embodied in this legislation, S. 3711, will be able to reduce this maybe down to 110 billion barrels because maybe we can get 5 billion barrels out of there.

Of course, a few months ago I came to the floor and said: Why are American companies not being allowed to drill in the northern properties off Cuba—where Cuba is now leasing that area out to China to drill, 50 miles off the U.S. shore. Why are not Americans out there doing that? That is another potentially 4.6 billion to 5 billion barrels of oil.

Add it all up, if we were able to use our skill, our talent that we have developed in the decade of the 1990s, and 2000 and beyond, for deepwater drilling, we could bring this much oil on line in a relatively short period of time.

But California says no. Florida, in large part, has said no, although the Senators from Florida have worked with us, and MEL MARTINEZ has done a beautiful job striking the balance to protect the environment of Florida and to drill in lease sale 181 off the coast of Florida.

But, then again, in these areas up through here, where there is tremendous potential off of the northeastern coast of our country, what do Vermont and Maine and New Hampshire and Rhode Island and Connecticut say? No, even though their consumers are paying $3.25 to $3.30 a gallon for gas. Where is the logic? Where is the sensitivity of that? Where is the sensibility of it?

I know America wishes we could snap our finger and this energy problem or crisis would be over. And it will not be. It took us 30 years marching down a path in which production was a negative, in which we said we simply did not have to produce; we could go someplace else and buy it. It is going to take a while to turn that around.

Last year, this Senate made a major step to turn that around. The National Energy Policy Act of 2005, known as EPAct, today, is bringing ethanol refineries or distilleries on line all across the Midwest as a part of producing into the whole energy supply of our country. Twenty percent of America's corn crop, being raised right now in the fields of Illinois and Iowa and Kansas and other places, will be used for ethanol production to go into the gas tanks of the American automobile. So we are moving in the right direction.

Last year at this time, as it relates to electrical production, we had about two reactors on the drawing board; that is, nuclear reactors. Folks, today there are 24 on the drawing board. Ten or 12 of them will be built, but it will take 10 or 12 years to build them. You do not overnight correct the problems you have created over the last 30 years.

The American consumer, in their sense of frustration, today is saying: Fix it. We like inexpensive energy. And I do not blame them. So do I. Last night, at $3.25 a gallon for that regular gas I put in my gas tank, I did not like it one bit. That is the bad news: high gas prices. The good news is: high gas prices. Today, we would not be on the floor debating lease sale 181 if gas were still $1.25 a gallon or even $2 a gallon. It was at $3 a gallon when the folks in Florida scratched their head and said: Maybe we could allow a little drilling out there. Maybe we could bring a little more on production. Maybe we ought to sit and listen to the reality of the environmental skills that our deepwater drillers have today in the production of oil, and we can do that and protect our environment at the same time. And we can. This legislation is going to do just that.

That is why what we pass this afternoon is critically important to the long-term stability and security of this country, to the strength and security of the average American family and consumer out there. It isn't that they will pay less after we do it; it is that they probably will not pay more.

In trying to level these prices and get this country back into production, I would hope that Americans quit saying no. I would hope that Senators would quit saying no and look at all of the alternatives out there today in a diverse energy portfolio of ethanol, of gas, of hydrogen, of nuclear generation for electricity, of wind and solar, and all the things we ought to bring into production in this country that we are working hard to do at this time.

I am not going to ask Americans to be patient. We are not a patient people. We are very impatient as a country. But it is going to take some time. It is going to take the concerted efforts of Senators such as PETE DOMENICI and myself and MEL MARTINEZ and others who have worked this issue as hard as we have to convince this Congress, that oftentimes is very resistant to change or very resistant to having to go out and face the very powerful environmental community and say: You know, you are just flat wrong. We can produce energy, and we can produce it cleanly for Americans, and provide it abundantly at a reasonable price—if we let the marketplace work, we put the parameters around it as it relates to what we expect from them in the safety and security of our environment but we do not say no. And for too long we have.

Finally, this afternoon, at around 5 o'clock, we are going to vote on S. 3711 and, hopefully, we will say: Yes, let's bring it on line. Let's produce it. Let's put trillions of cubic feet of gas into the gas pipelines and let's bring billions of barrels of crude into the refineries of the gulf coast.

Senate: Say yes. You have been too long saying no. Americans are frustrated and angry they are now having to pay a price they are not used to, and certainly have an abundance and a sense of security that most Americans have come to enjoy and expect of themselves living in this great country of ours, living with a system that works, and with a government that tends to be responsive to their needs. That is what this legislation is all about this afternoon.

So when the Senator from Mississippi counsels patience, I am an impatient guy, especially when it comes to my pocketbook. And I know most consumers are. I don't like paying $3.25 a gallon. I would like to find the boogeyman and blame somebody for it. We have ourselves to blame because the no-zone was created by public policy, not by the big oil companies. No. They would like to be there drilling and using the latest technology. No. The no-zone was created by public policy: no to the billions of barrels of oil that exist, as shown on this chart, in Alaska, in the Outer Continental Shelf, in the northern area off from Cuba, and in lease sale 181.

The reason we are not there today is public policy, is an environmental attitude that simply says ''we don't have to produce any more.'' Well, we do have to produce, but we need to do it cleanly, responsibly. That is what this legislation is about. That is what the energy policy of last year was about. This Government, thank goodness, has been listening and has finally heard the consumer and his and her frustration.

I would hope this afternoon we turn a no vote into a yes vote. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for S. 3711. It means a lot to the average family who is paying the price today for bad policy at the gas pumps of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand that Senator SCHUMER is supposed to go next. So I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized following Senator SCHUMER or, if the other side would like me to go first, I would go first. But it is my understanding the time should be charged to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator SCHUMER immediately follow me on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my very strong support for S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006, sponsored by our very able chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator DOMENICI. I was pleased to cosponsor S. 2253 with the chairman, which was an earlier version of this bill.

We must all recognize that the global oil market has changed dramatically, and we must pursue an energy-security strategy that takes into account a new set of realities.

We are now faced with the prospect of a long-term oil shortage conjoined with a serious lack of spare capacity among even the world's most reliable suppliers.

As OPEC's ability to respond to growing global demand for crude has slackened, so, too, has OPEC's ability to maintain a price band and the resulting political and price stability on which our Nation—more than any other—has been dependent. It is imperative we face the fact that even exhaustive efforts to conserve and increase renewable fuel production will still fall far short of bridging the gap between global supply and our world's swelling demand for liquid fuels.

Oil and natural gas have production. limits. We do not manufacture oil. In order to produce oil and natural gas we must go through a lengthy process of exploration and extraction. Increasingly our search for replacement light sweet crude has been coming up short.

Just as it is important to recognize the magnitude of our global energy shortage, it is equally important to recognize that North America has solutions that are being ignored. The passage of S. 3711 would allow us to benefit from one of the best solutions available.

Within our reach, in the Gulf of Mexico, we have an abundance of new sources of oil and gas. It is time we develop these new sources in order to help American families as they struggle against the rising cost of energy.

Mr. President, increasing our domestic supply of oil and gas will have a positive impact on every American and every American business. Unfortunately, Canada, one of our major natural gas suppliers, has struggled to increase production and deliver it to the United States. As a result, gas imports from Canada have dropped in recent years.

I don't see how this Congress can turn away an opportunity to gain access to the 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that this legislation would make available. This is enough natural gas to heat and cool nearly six million homes for 15 years.

And how can we ignore 1.26 billion barrels of oil which would become available through this proposal?

I understand there may be members of this body who will oppose this measure but I wonder why.

But if the Senate is to get serious about reducing our dependence on foreign oil, we must pass this legislation.

Reducing our foreign dependence by means of conservation, alone, will not work.

Conservation is a part of the solution, but it is only a small part.

The fact is, if we do not actually increase our domestic supply of oil and natural gas in a significant way, as soon as possible, our Nation will pay a very heavy price.

I have been a strong advocate of conservation and increasing efficiency.

Seven years ago, I recognized that about two-thirds of all our oil consumption is taken up by the transportation sector, and I began to draft the Clean Efficient Automobiles Resulting from Advanced Car Technologies Act, or CLEAR ACT.

The CLEAR ACT was made law as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and it is now providing strong tax incentives for the purchase of alternative fuel and hybrid-electric vehicles, for the installation of new alternative fueling stations, and for the use of alternative fuels in vehicles. We have had an explosion on the development of hybrid vehicles and alternative fules. The CLEAR Act had a lot to do with it.

It took me and my cosponsors substantial effort and political capital to pass the CLEAR Act, but we did it because we knew it was important to increase the efficiency of our transportation sector.

But I have never lost sight of the fact that our Nation absolutely must increase our domestic oil and gas production if we hope to continue to prosper and remain competitive.

Also, there are several longer term solutions to our Nation's energy needs, such as our vast resources of unconventional oil, that need to be implemented.

The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that recoverable oil shale in the western United States is somewhere between 800 billion and 1 trillion barrels of oil, but it is not counted among world reserves because it is not yet commercially developed.

I should point out that the world's oil reserves stand at just about 1.6 trillion barrels. That means, at a minimum, the U.S. can increase the world's oil reserves by 50 percent by implementing an aggressive policy to recover our own oil shale. We in the west understand that in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, that tri-State area, is an estimated 1 trillion barrels of recoverable oil from tar sands and oil shale.

Chairman DOMENICI and Senator ALLARD worked with me to ensure that the Energy Policy Act included strong provisions to promote the development of these unconventional resources.

However, even if the development of oil shale and tar sands is a success, as I believe it will be, it would not occur in time to save us from our current supply shortage.

S. 3711 is one of the few opportunities we have to improve our Nation's energy situation in the near term. I believe it represents an excellent compromise among the various interests involved, and I applaud the parties involved for bringing us to this point.

I hope this body will not throw this opportunity away. This is a way of helping our country, helping our citizens. This is a way of stabilizing the price of oil and of natural gas.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006.

Before I begin, let me say this: I want to try to put this in a general setting. We have an energy problem in this country. We all know about that. Every year, hundreds of billions of dollars flow out of the pocketbooks of hard-working men and women and end up in the pockets of people we don't like particularly, people in Iran and people in Venezuela, countries like them, leaders who don't really play ball with us in the Middle East or in the Soviet Union on so many issues. It is imperative that we get a grip on this. In the long run, there is only one solution, and that is independence from fossil fuels. We are doing so little on that, it is almost pathetic. We should have a crash program to free us of imports within 10 or 15 years. We should be putting every nickel in. We don't.

The Energy bills in the past have too often listened to the big oil companies which are happy with the status quo. Mr. Tillerson, head of ExxonMobil, came before our Judiciary Committee and said he didn't believe in alternative fuels. But that is down the road. Because even if we started today—and we should have started 5 or 10 years ago—that will take a while. So what do we do in the short run? It seems to me there has been a little bit too much deadlock here: one side, mainly our side, saying conserve—and we are right, there should be conservation—the other side saying produce more, not just alternative fuels, which I think are very important, alternative energy, which I think is very important, whether it be wind or solar or biofuels but those just nibble at the edges. The other side says we need to supply more fossil fuels. There is a deadlock. It is about time we broke the deadlock. An ideal bill would be one that breaks the deadlock on both sides, that increases supply of fossil fuels in a way that doesn't do grave damage to the environment and yet at the same time conserves. Such a bill is not yet here.

The majority in its wisdom does not allow such a bill to come forward. The majority doesn't allow amendments on conservation to be added to this bill. But this bill does move to increase supply in a certain portion of the gulf, 1.2 million barrels of oil, 5.8 trillion cubic feet of gas, in about 8 million acres. That is 1.2 billion barrels of oil we won't have to purchase from a Middle East that is, unfortunately, looking more volatile and less friendly day by day.

For the sake of consumers, it is clear we have to get gas prices under control. And while drilling in these 8 million acres isn't going to send the price plummeting—that takes a much larger endeavor and a larger picture—it will affect things at the margin. Gas prices are the highest they have been since the aftermath of Katrina. In my State, a family with two cars, two cars they need to get to work, drive the kids to the doctor and dentist, to get the groceries, can expect to pay $1,000 more in gas this year as compared to just 1 year ago. That is a tragedy for that family—not a tragedy, I guess, but an economic tragedy. If your income isn't that large, $1,000 is just too much. It is a huge burden—is a better way to put it—on working families as prices keep going up.

So I have thought a lot about this. I am going to vote for this bill. I have advocated in our caucus for this bill as a way of showing faith on this side of the aisle that when dramatic damage is not done to the environment, as it would be in Alaska where we are 10 years away, we are willing to look at increasing the supply of fossil fuels in the United States.

I am going to support this bill. I hope the other side will join us in allowing CAFE standards to come to the floor. A bipartisan bill sponsored by Senators LUGAR and OBAMA would be a great place to start. Then we would increase supply some and decrease demand some. It would make a huge difference. The fact that our CAFE standards are lower than that of China, a country with virtually no environmental conscience but, rather, a country interested in economics—and they understand the economics are very important.

Make no mistake about it, if this bill is tampered with in the House, if we go beyond these two areas and talk about drilling in the oceans, as the Congressman from California, Mr. POMBO, is, most of us on this side of the aisle will do everything we can to block that, and we will get no bill at all. Let that be a warning to the people in the House not to take advantage of our good faith here. By opening significant tracts for drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, I also believe this bill should give us less reason to drill in areas that are more environmentally sensitive like ANWR.

I am supporting this bill. I have urged my colleagues on this side of the aisle to support the bill. I appreciate the hard work the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, has done in persuading us to be for this bill. But this bill will be an empty promise if we don't go further, if we don't do more to conserve, if we don't do more to come up with a bipartisan approach that in the long run removes us from the stranglehold of fossil fuels and in the short run both increases supply and decreases demand for energy.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. This important energy legislation begins a process by which we start to produce more energy domestically. It moves our Nation and our economy one step away from foreign oil barons and one step closer to energy independence.

The legislation does so by opening up a portion of the Gulf of Mexico to energy production. Energy production in the Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, is not a new energy endeavor. The entire OCS is composed of 1.76 billion acres and there are 8,000 active lease areas producing oil and natural gas. This production translates to approximately 20 percent of our domestic oil production and approximately 30 percent of our domestic natural gas production. Unfortunately, as hard working families endure record prices each time they fill up their vehicles and as our Nation's ranchers and farmers struggle with higher fertilizer costs, more than 85 percent of the coastal waters around the lower 48 States currently are off limits to energy development.

This legislation is a step in the right direction. S. 3711 requires the Secretary of the Interior to offer mineral leases in what is known as lease area 181 within 1 year of enactment. Such leasing would translate to 1.26 billion barrels of oil and 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Those minerals could be used to help meet the energy needs of our economy and help ease the burden of high prices on our hard working families. Put in perspective, lease area 181 will provide enough natural gas to heat 6 million homes for 15 years.

Although I support the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, it is not perfect. I would prefer to see the act do more to open up a greater portion of the OCS to drilling. I would prefer that Federal royalties not be automatically directed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I would prefer that the bill allowed States that wanted energy development off their coasts to opt in and States that opposed energy development off their coasts to opt out.

While I would like to see these improvements made eventually, it is important to remember that S. 3711 is an excellent first step to expand our domestic energy production. Opening lease area 181 must be part of a broad and comprehensive strategy to expand our traditional energy portfolio as we develop better technologies such as clean coal and hydrogen. Every great endeavor starts with a first step. The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act is a good first step, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I strongly support S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. I would like to thank Senator DOMENICI, chairman of the Energy Committee, for his hard work in making this compromise possible. This legislation is a much needed step to increase the domestic production of natural gas and crude oil.

In recent years, the cost for natural gas has risen from the moderate, stable level of $3 per thousand cubic feet to $6, and even exceeded $10 last fall. Current prices are three times the average during the 1990s.

In just the past few days, natural gas prices have risen by nearly 15 percent. Why? Because the current heat wave crossing the country is putting a strain on our Nation's electrical grid—an electrical grid that is increasingly dependent on electricity generated from natural gas.

And, while the demand for natural gas has increased, we have done little as a nation to ensure that there is access to the domestic supply to meet the growing demand. For too many years, our country has had a ''natural gas and nothing else'' policy.

The Energy Policy Act, which we enacted a year ago, took significant steps to diversify our energy production and increase energy efficiency. The Energy bill included provisions to expand the use of clean coal and advanced nuclear technologies. It also included provisions to expand the use of renewable and alternative energy and energy conservation. All of these provisions will help in the long term to balance and diversify our energy portfolio.

However, we need to take action today to increase the supply of domestically produced energy. The fact is, consumers in the United States are paying some of the highest natural gas costs in the world. This puts our farmers, manufacturers, and industrial users of natural gas at a competitive disadvantage.

Few things are as important to the livelihood and well-being of Iowa's economy than natural gas. Although the State of Iowa is considered a national leader in the agricultural industry, our manufacturing industry actually contributes five to six times more to Iowa's economy than agriculture. Manufacturers have been particularly hard hit by the increase in prices because they consume over one-third of our country's natural gas. I have heard from manufacturers across Iowa who have urged Congress to act to increase the supply of affordable natural gas.

Farming is also an extremely energy-intensive industry. Farmers and ranchers need large amounts of natural gas for drying crops, heating buildings, producing ethanol, and most importantly, as the feedstock of chemicals and fertilizers.

The vast majority of the cost of nitrogen fertilizers is natural gas. Numerous domestic manufacturers of ammonia and nitrogen fertilizer have closed in recent years due to higher costs. As a result, prices for their products have increased. Ammonia for fall application this year will cost a farmer nearly $400 a ton. This is double what it was just a few years ago.

This legislation will also help my constituents with their home heating and electricity bills. A significant portion of Iowa households use natural gas for their home heating. Even while the past few winters have been relatively mild, home heating bills have doubled and tripled for some families. And, while I have been an ardent supporter of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program that helps the less fortunate pay for home heating, we must also recognize that the high prices are a result of the tight energy supply. One way to ensure that consumers aren't forced to choose between heating their home and putting food on the table is to lower the price for natural gas.

That is why I am eager to see this bill pass. The compromise bill before us will open up 8.3 million acres on the Outer Continental Shelf for oil and gas leasing. It requires that leasing begin as soon as practicable but no later than 1 year after the date of enactment. This area is estimated to hold 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 1.26 billion barrels of oil. This legislation will take a significant step to enhance our county's domestic energy supply.

This bill is a proactive response to the rising cost of energy and our growing dependence on foreign sources of crude oil. It is a bipartisan agreement that has the support of the Gulf State Senators, and it deserves our full support. I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this bill which will increase our energy supplies and help stabilize prices for our consumers, farmers, and manufacturers.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today I rise in support of S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act.

This energy bill will open more than 8.3 million acres on the Outer Continental Shelf for oil and gas leasing. This area is estimated to produce 1.26 billion barrels of oil and 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. I expect as new technologies are developed this estimate of recoverable resources will only grow.

As oil and natural gas prices fluctuate, many Americans, especially Montanans, are feeling the strain of increased prices for energy use in their homes and businesses. The natural gas supply made available by this bill will heat and cool nearly 6 million homes for 15 years.

Additionally, an increased supply of natural gas will greatly benefit Montana's agriculture producers who are particularly hard hit by skyrocketing costs of fuel and fertilizer. Natural gas is the primary feedstock in virtually all fertilizer manufactured in the United States. Increased production of domestic natural gas will help stabilize prices and decrease our dependence on foreign suppliers of natural gas such as Venezuela and Russia.

In order to strengthen American energy security, it is our obligation to use our own domestic resources whenever we can. Offshore drilling has proven to be safe, reliable, and environmentally responsible for oil and gas production. While this bill is limited in scope, it is an important first step to increasing our energy supply to meet our country's demands. Lease area 181 is a phenomenal resource, and time after time in energy committee hearings when we ask expert witnesses for their opinions on how to best stabilize and lower natural gas prices, the answer is: Open lease area 181.

I applaud the leadership of Chairman DOMENICI and the bipartisan groups of Senators that hammered out this compromise. I urge my fellow Senators to support this bill and pass this important piece of our energy security.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to discuss today's vote on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, S. 3711. I support the bill because it will provide a needed source of natural gas, which is a clear-burning fuel, and its passage is realistically calculated to have a positive impact on natural gas prices for American consumers and businesses. While voting for the bill, my preference would be for it to contain conservation, energy efficiency, and other measures beyond Gulf of Mexico development to address our Nation's growing energy needs.

The issue of energy prices is on the top of Americans' minds and their list of expectations for elected officials to address. For a number of months, there has been discussion in the Senate of a possible energy bill to follow the 2005 Energy Policy Act. However, despite the great importance of this issue and intense interest from Senators who have suggested various energy proposals, we are now presented with only one option, a bill to allow oil and natural gas leasing in a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico. Beyond the narrow scope this bill, there have also been questions raised as to the 37.5 percent share of revenues going to the four Gulf of Mexico States—Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas—instead of the Federal Treasury, and concerns about the eventual bill emanating from a House-Senate conference.

Unfortunately, this bill and the way it has been considered miss an important opportunity to build on the successes of the 2005 energy bill and deal with our nation's energy policy in a comprehensive manner. This is likely the last energy-related bill to receive floor consideration prior to the recess for the November elections and the eventual adjournment of the 109th Congress. That means we will have to return to the beginning of the legislative process upon the commencement of the 110th Congress.

That is why I am greatly disappointed that Senators were unable to have amendments to this bill considered. Amendments were precluded by a rarely used legislative procedure known as ''filling the tree'' which occurs when the majority leader offers the maximum number of amendments allowable under the official Senate rules in order to preclude amendments from other Senators.

As I stated on the floor last night, I had hoped to have the Senate consider my Oil and Gas Company Antitrust Act, S. 2557, as an amendment. The Judiciary Committee held hearings on the issue of competition in the oil and gas industry and the committee voted S. 2557 to the Senate floor on April 27, 2006. The Judiciary Committee's hearings considered the many factors brought about by consolidation in the oil and gas industry. The testimony indicated that market concentration is a problem in the industry. Responding to these concerns, my bill would prohibit individual firms from exporting petroleum and natural gas products with the intent of increasing prices or creating shortages in the market. Further, the bill would allow the government to prosecute cartels such as OPEC that set the price of petroleum and natural gas, even when the cartel members are foreign states. This bill would encourage vigorous competition in the oil and gas industry to ensure that the forces of supply and demand are working and that the industry is competitive.

I also cosponsored an amendment offered by Senators LUGAR and OBAMA to provide for a 4 percent annual increase in Corporate Average Fuel Economy, CAFE, standards. This is a rate that the National Academy of Sciences has determined is possible, but could be altered if the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, can prove that the increase is technologically unachievable, cannot maintain overall fleet safety or is not cost effective. The bill provides flexibility to domestic automakers by establishing different standards for various types of cars to enable domestic manufacturers that produce full lines of small and large vehicles to better compete with companies that only sell small cars. Credit would also be given for exceeding fuel economy standards in one type of car to help meet goals with other vehicle models. Finally, the bill provides tax incentives for companies to retool parts and assembly plants to develop advanced-technology vehicles.

I note that Senator BINGAMAN has offered an oil conservation amendment No. 4692, which would save 2.5 million barrels (bbl) of oil per day by 2016; 7 million bbl/day by 2026; and 10 million bbl/day by 2031. I was disappointed that the 2005 energy bill did not include a similar oil savings goal which would have required the administration to identify and implement policies reducing domestic oil consumption by 1 million barrels per day from projections by 2013. This provision was based on the Carper-Specter amendment from 2002 and the Landrieu-Specter amendment in 2003 which passed by a vote of 99 to 1. These are modest goals, but ones which would help focus the Federal Government in reducing oil imports in support of energy independence, national security, and lower trade deficits.

The energy bill conference also deleted the Senate provisions mandating that by the year 2020 at least 10 percent of our electricity be produced from renewable resources. This goal was meant to help spur development of renewable resources, which currently account for just over 2 percent of U.S. electricity production. Pennsylvania is currently implementing a similar Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard with an eighteen-percent goal by 2020 of electricity production from renewable and other alternative energy sources.

Despite my desire to see additional energy issues debated, I say to my colleagues that I am sensitive to the price and supply concerns that have led to the consideration of the Gulf of Mexico legislation. The natural gas supply and demand imbalance has caused U.S. prices to increase from an average of $2.20 per million BTUs during the 1994–1999 timeframe to $8.84 per million BTUs in 2005, which is the highest average natural gas cost in the world. These high prices have increased economic pressure on American consumers and industry, particularly those who use natural gas to heat their homes and industrial sectors that rely on natural gas as a fuel and as a raw material.

Finally, when it comes to oil prices the problem is well known. All Americans are facing high gasoline prices at the pump and are expected to have high heating oil prices this winter. With gasoline hovering just above $3 per gallon nationally while this bill has been debated, there is no better time to discuss energy issues and ensure that Congress is doing everything in its power to address them. While the 2005 Energy Policy Act provided an important framework and policy direction from which to proceed, it did not address every facet of these complex issues and has not convinced the American people, nor me, that nothing more can be done. Therefore, I encourage the Senate to consider additional energy-related measures at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today the Senate will be voting on S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. I regret that I cannot support this bill for a number of reasons.

First, I am deeply disappointed that the majority leader used parliamentary maneuvers to prohibit any Senators from offering amendments to the bill before us today. While I did vote last week to allow for the consideration of this legislation, I did so with the hope that Senator FRIST would allow both Republicans and Democrats to offer amendments that are important to our energy security. In fact, I am a cosponsor of a number of bipartisan amendments that were scheduled to be offered to S. 3711. But unfortunately, the bill before us today is the only energy bill that the Senate will debate this summer. That is not in the best interest of the American consumer, the economy, or our long-term energy security.

I have long advocated a more balanced approach to solving our energy problems. Any serious solution to our energy crisis must involve increasing efficiency, expanding our conservation efforts, and committing to renewable forms of energy. Unfortunately, however, the sole focus of S. 3711 is oil and natural gas exploration in the Gulf of Mexico. Contrary to what supporters of the bill contend, this legislation does nothing in the short term to rein in the soaring fuel and energy prices because of the lag time it will take to extract the allowed oil and gas. Further, this bill redirects some of the revenues from Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, drilling from the Federal Treasury to just four States.

For more than 25 years, most of the coastal areas of the country have been under either a Presidential moratorium on OCS drilling due to expire in 2012 or a congressional moratorium enacted annually through the appropriations process. Under this bill, for the first time, one State—Florida—is given statutory protection from offshore drilling through 2022. No similar statutory protection exists for the Atlantic or Pacific coasts.

In fact, there are some Members of Congress who would like their States to be able to opt out of any future moratorium. While this provision is not included in S. 3711, it is included in the House-passed bill that likely will be conferenced with S. 3711. If we adopt a fractured system and allow drilling in adjacent States, I am concerned that our fragile coastal ecosystems and economies could be threatened by pollution associated with drilling and unforseen incidents due to the drilling activity, weather, and possible terrorist attacks. Let us remember that our coastal waters flow freely and what happens in the waters off one state may have serious repercussions up and down the coast.

I deeply regret that in considering the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act we were not able to debate meaningful bipartisan amendments to address many of the serious energy concerns facing our Nation. It is my fear that in the dwindling days of this session we will not again have the opportunity to revisit these critically important issues and consumers and businesses will continue to struggle to meet their energy needs. Mr. President, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act truly represents a missed opportunity.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, every one of us in Congress has heard from our constituents about the high cost of gas. A gallon is now $3 or more in most parts of the country, and there is every reason to believe that figure will continue to climb throughout the rest of the summer.

Americans are asking their Members of Congress to help lower some of these costs. And we should do that. But let us not kid ourselves. This is a problem that was decades in the making, and short-term political solutions—whether it is a tax rebate or more legislation to stop price gouging—aren't going to be the complete answer.

To be sure, most of these proposals would do no harm, and many would provide Americans some temporary relief at the pump. But in the long term, we can't rely solely on quick fixes designed to placate an anxious public.

We need solutions designed to permanently lessen our dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, both Congress and the White House have been unwilling to take the politically difficult steps necessary to confront one of the most pressing economic and national security challenges of the 21st century.

A perfect example is the bill before us. It does do some good things: it marginally increases the supply of oil, and it provides a financial boost to Gulf Coast States that could use the help.

But fundamentally, the bill only focuses on part of the problem—our inadequate supply of oil. Unfortunately, increasing supply can't be our only answer. Even if we opened up every square inch of this country for drilling, America only has 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. With our own Energy Department telling us that our demand for oil will jump 40 percent over the next 20 years and countries such as China and India adding millions of cars to their roads, this means that if we truly hope to solve this problem, we must focus on reducing demand.

Members on both sides of the aisle have suggested some innovative ways to do this. Senator LUGAR and I introduced the America Fuels Act to increase the production of homegrown biofuels. And Senator BUNNING and I have worked on a bill to produce liquid fuels from coal.

Unfortunately, we are not going to have a debate this week on how to reduce the demand for oil, because we weren't allowed to add any amendments to this bill that would focus on that problem. Because contrary to the judgment of every credible person who has examined our Nation's energy woes, the Republican leadership in the Senate believes we can solve our energy problems by just drilling more. That is not only dishonest; it is a disservice to our constituents who want us to work together to solve this crisis.

I would like to spend a few minutes today discussing two of the proposals that should have been part of this energy debate—two proposals that could have made this bill worthwhile.

First, we need to start producing cars that use less oil. Thirty-three years ago, this Nation faced an energy crisis that affected every American. In the shadow of a war against Israel, the Arab nations of OPEC chose to embargo shipments of crude oil to the West. The shocks were felt in national economies worldwide. Washington lawmakers responded by creating daylight savings time and a national speed limit. A new Department of Energy and a Strategic Petroleum Reserve was established. And Congress enacted Corporate Average Fuel Economy—or CAFE—standards, the first-ever requirements to reduce petroleum consumption in the vehicles we drive.

As a result, the gas mileage of cars doubled from 14 miles per gallon in 1976 to 27.5 mpg for cars in 1985. Today, CAFE saves us about 3 million barrels of oil per day, making it among the most successful energy-saving measures ever adopted. But that decade's worth of fuel consumption improvements ended more than 20 years ago, because CAFE standards are the same today as they were in 1985 27.5 mpg for cars.

To address this problem, I have joined with Senator LUGAR and a bipartisan coalition of senators to propose the Fuel Economy Reform Act, which we have also filed as an amendment to the OCS bill.

This amendment would establish regular, continual, and incremental progress in fuel economy, but still preserve the expertise and flexibility of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—or NHTSA—to determine how to meet those targets.

Under this proposal, CAFE standards would increase by 4 percent every year unless NHTSA can justify a deviation in that rate by proving that the increase is either technologically unachievable, would materially reduce the safety of automobiles, or is not cost effective. For too long, the presumption has been that the public would have to prove to the auto industry why it should raise fuel economy standards. This proposal would flip that presumption by asking the auto industry to prove why it can't raise those standards.

Under this system, if the 4 percent annualized improvement occurs for 10 years, we would save 1.3 million barrels of oil per day—an astounding 20 billion gallons of gasoline per year. If gasoline is just $2.50 per gallon, consumers would save $50 billion at the pump in 2018. By 2018, we would be cutting global warming pollution by 220 million metric tons of carbon-dioxide-equivalent gases.

And yet, auto executives are right when they say that transitioning to more fuel-efficient automobiles would be costly at a time of sagging profits and stiff competition, and that's precisely why the Federal Government shouldn't let the industry face these challenges on their own.

The Fuel Economy Act provides tax incentives to retool parts and assembly plants. But we should do more than that. We need to help the Big Three automakers with one of their largest expenses, namely, retiree health care costs, which ran almost $6.7 billion just last year. For GM, these health care costs represent $1,500 of the price of every GM car that is made, which is more than what they pay for the steel.

To that end, I also have filed an amendment to this bill based on the Health Care for Hybrids Act that I introduced last year. That proposal would set up a voluntary program in which automakers could choose to receive Federal financial assistance towards their retiree health care costs. In return, the automakers would be required to reinvest these savings into developing fuel-efficient vehicles.

With the American consumer demanding more hybrid vehicles—and that demand currently being filled by foreign automakers—this proposal could jumpstart the Big Three to commercialize new technology. More American hybrid cars also ensure that there is competition in this growing market, and would help keep car prices affordable.

If we had adopted these two proposals decades ago, when the call for energy independence was first issued in this country, today we wouldn't be nearly as beholden to the whims of oil-rich dictators and surging gas prices. And if we don't take these steps now, we will someday look back on today's $3 per gallon gasoline as the good old days. At that point, no amount of drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf will solve our problems.

We could have taken these commonsense steps now to reduce the demand for oil. We have the need, we have the technology, we have the resources—but with this bill, we refused to find the political will to get it done. We still owe it to the American public to find that will.

Unfortunately, this bill sends the wrong message. Instead of making tough political decisions about how to reduce our insatiable demand for oil, this bill continues to lull the American people into thinking that we can drill our way out of our energy problems. We can't, and for that reason, I plan to vote against this bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, yesterday, while the Senate was voting for cloture on S. 3711, a bill that could ultimately lead to exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf of the Georges Bank in the North Atlantic Ocean, the Maine lobster industry gathered on a picturesque fishing pier in Maine to launch the ''Certified Maine Lobster'' initiative that could bring an added value to the State's $300 million lobster industry. My State accounts for 80 percent of lobster landings and is known for its lobster boats, lobster shacks, lobster buoys and lobster dinners along its scenic coastline. As a matter of fact, the Maine Lobstermen Association was formed to fight OCS drilling off the coast of Maine.

It is because of its very pristine value that fisheries and tourism are important economic engines for the State and I cannot stand by and let these natural resources be compromised through exploration and drilling. Last year, Maine lobstermen hauled in more than 60 million pounds for a boat price of $296 million.

While supporters of, S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006, say that this bill is only about the Gulf of Mexico, while at the same time stating that the bill is the first step toward opening up more areas to production. One supporter was even quoted as saying, ''The goal is to maximize over time the coastal production of America from a venue of stagnation.'' This does not sound like the bill pertains only to the Gulf of Mexico, as its supporters have stated and this has rightfully alarmed the people of my State, many who make their living directly or indirectly from the sea. Scientists, economists, and fishermen have worked for 20 to 30 years to restore the magnificent fish runs off the New England coast. To them, lifting the moratorium and allowing oil and gas drilling on the 185-mile-long broad, shallow and productive fishing ground of Georges Bank that stretches from Nova Scotia to Cape Cod is unconscionable.

As chairman of the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Coast Guard, the prospect of drilling in the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank and risking New England's fisheries is unacceptable to me as well. I, along with Senator MENENDEZ, wanted to offer a simple amendment to ensure that drilling within 200 miles of the coast of Maine and other coastal States would continue to be prohibited until 2022—the same protection as is given the State of Florida in this bill.

However, without following the usual amendment process, there can be no assurances that Maine's coast will be protected when this legislation is approved by a conference or that the Joint Ocean Commission's recommendation to convert current OCS revenues for ocean fisheries research will occur, and without those assurances, I have not supported moving forward.

I am extremely disappointed that the decision was made to prevent amendments during debate that ignores the need to address conservation. We were told it would take a week to get through amendments that would have been offered. Well, this bill was brought up 1 week ago, and, instead of having true and fair debates on conservation amendments this past week and up or down votes, we have spent it on moving to cloture and getting to final passage.

I believe that considering the leasing of additional OCS waters for oil and gas drilling should only be done with utmost caution and deliberation, and at the same time, I believe that our national energy policy should seriously focus resources on the development of renewable energy and an expansion of energy efficiencies as part of a national energy policy.

I have filed an amendment to this bill that is also my stand alone bill, S. 3628, the EXTEND Energy Efficiency Incentives Act of 2006, that would extend the EPAct 2005 energy efficiency tax incentives until 2010—they currently expire at the end of next year having been shortened by the House in conference. Experts have calculated that, if fully implemented, the EXTEND Act will, by 2010, save 7 trillion cubic feet, Tcf, of natural gas while the Gulf of Mexico drilling bill before us would extract 5.8 Tcf by 2010. We simply cannot continue to drill ourselves out of this problem, and threaten our natural resources—we can do it with bold ideas that save much more than we can get from drilling.

A reliance on only fossil fuels retards progress in developing a sustainable and comprehensive 21st century energy policy. Furthermore, the recent fluctuation of the world oil and natural gas markets indicates that this commodity is not a reliable long-term energy source. There are uncertainties involved with fossil fuels that threatens the energy security of the United States and it is important that our nation recognize the situation and develop a diverse, sustainable and progressive energy plan through a market basket of fossil fuels, renewable energy and energy efficiencies.

Senator FEINSTEIN and I were not allowed to offer our 10 in 10 bill as an amendment to this bill to require U.S. automakers to increase their average CAFE standards by 10 miles per gallon in 10 years. The bill would save 2.5 million barrels of oil per day by 2025, the same amount of oil we currently import from the Persian Gulf; and 420 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions by 2025, the equivalent of taking 90 million cars—or 75 million cars and light trucks—off the road in one year. Again, we can save rather than drill.

Exxon Mobil, the world's largest traded oil company, just reported a 36 percent gain in 2nd earnings. Exxon has prospered because of the high gasoline prices bolstered by the demand for supply. Increasing CAFE standards will decrease demand, lower prices and begin to put some of this money in the pockets of consumers rather than the large oil companies, who have increased output and taken advantage of the increase in oil prices, which remain over $70 a barrel.

The small increase from the latest NHTSA rule for CAFE standards for SUVs does little to save gasoline and only gives lipservice to an issue that deserves more serious consideration. Even a modest increase of only five miles per gallon in the fuel efficiency of our domestic automotive fleet would save approximately 23 billion gallons of gasoline each year and reduce oil imports by 14 percent.

This percentage is more than the 11 percent Venezuela provides for U.S. oil imports. The GAO reports that the U.S. is inadequately prepared to face the possibility of President Hugo Chavez' threat to cut off its oil imports to the U.S. The GAO reports that this disruption would cause an increase of $11 per barrel. So we are allowing Chavez to put us over a diplomatic oil barrel, so to speak. Why are we taking this risk with the trust of the American people and the economy when there are options that can be put in place to make us independent of Venezuela's oil—and political maneuvering?

Currently, the combined fleet average for all automobiles, SUVs, light trucks and passenger cars, is approximately 25 miles per gallon—that is down from the peak of 26.2 miles per gallon in 1987. The Feinstein-Snowe-Inouye-Chafee 10 in 10 bill would increase that combined fleet average to 35 miles per gallon by Model Year 2017—or ten mpgs 10 years from today.

Also, according to the 2002 National Academy of Sciences Report on CAFE, adequate lead time can bring about substantive increases in fuel economy standards. The NAS concluded that automakers can meet higher CAFE standards with existing technologies. We have the technologies today to increase our fuel economy standards. We have hybrids, more efficient engine technology, improved transmission technology, and composite materials that reduce the weight of the vehicle will all increase fuel economy standards without sacrificing safety.

I fear that the Senate conferees will come back from a conference with many of the provisions in the House bill, the Deep Ocean Resources Act, H.R 4761, a bill that replaces the moratorium that currently protects most of the nation's coastline from oil and natural gas drilling and develops a leasing system that would provide the option for states to allow drilling within 50 miles of their coastlines and allow drilling throughout the OCS beyond 100 miles. Currently, the moratorium protects the coastal area up to 200 miles out.

In passing this OCS drilling only bill today, the Senate has created lost opportunities that could have addressed how much we could save—along with how much we can drill. This is what the consumers want to hear—that we are addressing every avenue possible to keep money in their pockets the next time they go to the gas pump or pay their electricity bill or purchase heating oil for the coming winter. The Senate has let the consumers down once again. And, the bill does nothing to protect Maine's tourist and fishing economies and its 3,500 miles of coastline.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, once again, this body has missed a chance to pass responsible, effective legislation responding to the very real and very pressing energy needs of this country. While there may be pieces of S. 3711 that have merit, I did not support cloture and I will not vote in favor of the final bill.

I voted to allow the Senate to consider S. 3711 in the hope that we might have a serious discussion of the bill, including debating and voting on amendments to improve it. While the bill only addresses one part of our energy needs, it could have provided an opportunity for the Senate to finally address a broad range of energy issues. Unfortunately, Senators were prevented from offering amendments, so there was no opportunity to address, for example, efficiency, conservation, renewable fuels, or even global warming. The result is another missed opportunity to pass the comprehensive energy legislation that our constituents are looking for.

In addition to opposing the flawed process for consideration of S. 3711, I have grave concerns about the fiscal implications of the legislation. This bill will redirect billions of dollars in Federal revenues to just four States. While I agree that we have a responsibility to ensure that Federal dollars are going to important activities like protecting and restoring coastal wetlands, I do not believe that doing so requires creation of a new entitlement for a handful of States. If enacted, S. 3711 will have massive long-term and negative consequences. For example, in 2017, the loss to the taxpayers of the country is estimated to be over $590 million a year, jumping to over $1.2 billion per year in 2022. Adding it all up, you get a total likely loss of over $170 billion over 60 years. I am not prepared to support such a massive drain on the Federal Treasury for the benefit of a few States and I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 3711.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I believe that as part of a balanced energy policy, we need to expand domestic oil and gas production where it has local support and can do so in an environmentally sound way. I think the bill before the Senate meets that test, and that is why I am voting for it. However, I want to make it clear that New Yorkers do not support drilling off Long Island, or in the Finger Lakes, or in the Great Lakes, and I will vehemently oppose any bill that would open any of these areas up for drilling. With that in mind, I am concemed about conferencing the Senate bill with the House bill, but I have been assured by Senator REID that he will oppose efforts to expand drilling beyond the areas included in the Senate bill. In addition, I am disappointed that Senator FRIST chose to block all amendments to this bill. Expanding domestic supplies is only a partial solution to our energy problems. It is even more important that we take steps to increase energy efficiency and to expand production of renewable energy. I filed amendments to this bill to accomplish those goals, but was not afforded the opportunity to offer them. I will continue to urge Senator FRIST to schedule time to consider these and other bills that offer a more comprehensive long-term solution to our Nation's energy problems.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am in opposition to the bill before us that opens up new areas in the Gulf of Mexico to oil and gas drilling. I don't dispute that the oil and natural gas that may be harvested as a result of this legislation could be useful, and I would support drilling from some new sources—if the value of doing so is not outweighed by the risks to our environment and economies. But it is not a solution to our energy problems.

Here we are, yet again, with a so-called ''energy'' plan that only offers one plan for our energy security crisis: drilling. That is not much of a plan. That is not going to free our foreign policy. That is not going to lower prices at the pump.

We consume a quarter of the oil in the world, but we have less than 2 percent of the world's reserves—that 2 percent includes the areas under debate today. If we tapped all the reserves in Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico and off the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, we would increase output by 2 million barrels a day by 2020. Yet our consumption is expected to rise to 25 million and world consumption to 110 million, so the impact on price and energy security would be minimal. Drops in the bucket.

We need a real energy policy, a real path toward energy security. For instance, we can make the biggest difference and have the most immediate impact by reducing oil consumption where we use it most: the transportation sector. That's why I have proposed four steps to begin the transition to alternative fuels and make us more energy secure: (1) 100 percent of cars running on alternative fuels; (2) 50 percent of major gas stations selling it; (3) 25 percent farm-grown fuel; (4) 1 mile per gallon more fuel efficient each year.

And if we are going to drill in new areas, we need to make sure we do it right, and not bypass the appropriately careful process and environmental reviews that are required by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The leadership put this bill before the Senate and said: ''take it or leave it.'' This bill could have been much better, and I fear that the bill that will come back from the House will be much worse.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on final passage of S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. I will be voting against passage because I believe this bill is poor energy policy, irresponsible fiscal policy, and faulty environmental policy.

The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act is a misnomer. The bill will not offer energy security to the United States. The United States consumes 25 percent of the world's energy and yet we have less than 3 percent of the world's oil supplies. While I agree that we must increase the domestic supply of oil and natural gas, this cannot be our Nation's only approach. Yet it is the only approach offered in S. 3711, and it is the only approach that the administration and Republican leadership continue to propose as our Nation's energy solution. Our Nation's energy security depends on reducing our dependency on fossil fuels through increased energy efficiency, greater investment in renewable energy, and development of alternative fuels to replace oil. But this bill does nothing to increase fuel efficiency standards for automobiles, create a national renewable energy standard for electricity, or promote energy efficiency or renewable energy. In fact, Federal investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy continues to decline. It is imperative for our Nation's energy and economic security that an energy policy that increases supply must be married to meaningful investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy. This is the energy policy that our Nation deserves, but it is not the one before us today.

S. 3711 is also not sound fiscal policy. This legislation would mandate that almost 38 percent of revenue from Federal resources generated by new leases in the Gulf of Mexico be given to four States—Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. These are revenues that currently would be provided to the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the Nation as a whole. Reducing revenue to the Treasury means that we, as a nation, will have fewer resources available in the future to respond to a call for help should there be another devastating natural disaster or terrorism attack. Our Nation faces a deficit of $8.4 trillion due to this administration's poor fiscal management and irresponsible tax policies. Large Federal budget deficits going forward are bad for the economy. They reduce national saving, which depresses future standards of living. Reducing Federal receipts and increasing the budget deficit at the same time as the baby boom generation retires will put increased strains on the Federal budget and makes no sense. This bill, if passed, will cost the Federal Treasury billions of dollars. I am not alone in my opposition to this legislation; taxpayer advocates share my concerns over its fiscal impact.

In the early 1950s, Congress considered the allocation of revenues between the Federal Government and States resulting from drilling in our Nation's waters. During the debate last week on S. 3711, I quoted from a speech that Senator Truman gave at the National Convention Banquet of the Americans for Democratic Action on May 17, 1952. President Truman stated in this speech, ''The minerals that lie under the sea off the coasts of this country belong to the Federal Government''—— that is, to all the people of this country. The ownership has been affirmed and reaffirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States. Those rights may be worth as much as somewhere between $40 billion and $100 billion.

If we back down on our determination to hold these rights for all the people, we will act to rob them of this great national asset. That is just what the oil lobby wants. They want us to turn the vast treasure over to a handful of States, where the powerful private oil interests hope to exploit it to suit themselves.

Twice President Truman vetoed quitclaim legislation passed by Congress to turn these resources over to the coastal States. In his May 29, 1952, veto statement, President Truman said ''[T]he Congress should provide for the disposition of the revenues obtained from oil and gas leases on the undersea lands. S.J. Res. 20, as introduced by Senators O'Mahoney and Anderson, would have granted the adjacent coastal States 37½ percent of the revenues from submerged lands of the marginal sea. I would have not object to such a provision, which is similar to existing provisions under which the State receive 37½ percent of the revenues from the Federal Government's oil-producing public lands within their borders.'' In his veto statement, it is clear that President Truman did not support giving coastal States revenue from the Outer Continental Shelf.

In the end, the coastal States received much more generous compensation than the provision offered by Senators O'Mahoney and Anderson and President Truman. When President Eisenhower signed the Submerged Lands Act, the coastal States were given title to and ownership of the lands beneath the territorial seas and the right to manage the natural resources within the States' boundaries. This law gave the States 100 percent of the revenue from coastal drilling in State waters. Importantly, the law affirmed the Federal Government's ownership in lands seaward of the State boundaries. Revenues from Outer Continental Shelf drilling belong to the American people in all 50 States. The legislation that the Senate is considering today violates this pact with the American people, and denies the Federal Treasury and American people of essential revenue to address the needs of our Nation it violates. It also is contrary to our national motto, E pluribus unum, from many one. Revenues from Federal resources should, and must, benefit all Americans.

Lastly, I believe this bill is not responsible environmental policy. The bill threatens our coastal ecosystems with the risk of pollution and oilspills which will harm the economies and families that rely on these resources. Unfortunately, the Senate is likely to pass this bill. This will pave the way for the Senate bill to be conferenced with H.R. 4761, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act. This legislation would lift the moratorium on offshore drilling for all of our coastlines the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf of Mexico, and Alaska—and, it would allow drilling for oil and gas in coastal national parks and marine sanctuaries. This would put our coastal communities at risk to oilspills, onshore damage of sensitive coastal habitat, and air and water pollution.

Oil is extremely toxic and our current cleanup methods are incapable of removing more than a small fraction of the oil spilled into our marine waters. Offshore drilling platforms and pipelines spilled 1.8 million gallons of oil in U.S. waters from 1990 to 1999, for an average of 500 gallons a day, which causes irreversible harm.

Narragansett Bay and our coast support vital commercial fisheries, tourism important to our economy, and an abundance of wildlife. Our economy and environment are vulnerable to oilspills. My State remembers the devastating effects that the North Cape oil-spill had in southern Rhode Island. Oil spread throughout a large area of Block Island Sound, including Trustom Pond National Wildlife Refuge, resulting in the closure of a 250-square mile area of the sound for fishing. There were hundreds of oiled birds in the weeks following the spill and large numbers of dead lobsters, surf clams, and sea stars were found on area beaches. There was also the World Prodigy oilspill off Newport, RI, which spread over 123 square miles, killing marine life and closing beaches and fishing grounds throughout Narragansett Bay. The spill hit during a peak spawning period. Eggs and larvae of fish and shellfish lobsters, quahogs, tautog, and others—were exposed to the oil as they floated at the surface.

Before opening new lands to development and denying the American people of a great asset and Federal revenues, we need to take meaningful action to reduce our consumption and increase renewable energy supplies. The only way to achieve greater energy independence is to reduce our consumption of fossil fuels overall. This is the energy policy that our Nation deserves, and this is the policy I will continue to fight for. I urge the Senate to reject S. 3711, and instead, pursue the vehicles and rule choices and the clean EDGE legislation that will set America on a true road to energy independence.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in support of legislation that expands access to domestically produced oil and natural gas by opening new areas for exploration in the Gulf of Mexico.

Earlier this spring, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee took action on a similar bill introduced by Senators BINGAMAN and DOMENICI. That bill provided the framework for today's action by garnering an important, early consensus on the need to bring on-line additional gas and oil reserves. As a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I supported moving that earlier version through the Energy Committee with the goal of lowering energy input costs for agriculture producers, and manufacturers.

This bill strikes an appropriate balance by focusing on Outer Continental Shelf lands located in relative close proximity to the existing infrastructure of natural gas gathering and distribution lines necessary to deliver oil and gas to consumers. When compared to a competing version passed by the House of Representatives that throws long-standing environmental provisions and drilling moratoriums out the window, the Senate bill is a reasoned and responsible bill. I do, however, share the concerns of many other Senators that the final legislation cannot include many of the damaging provisions included in the House of Representatives-passed bill. I will do my best to convince my colleagues in the coming weeks that the best, quickest path toward bringing more than 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to market is through a conference report that maintains the key aspects of the Senate bill.

I also want to let my colleagues know that I am determined to ensure that a final bill include additional funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as well as wildlife habitat funding through the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Account. I introduced an amendment cosponsored by Senator LINCOLN that seeks to use a portion of the royalties, rents, and bonus bids from Lease Sale 181 South after 2017 for this important purpose. Should Congress make the determination to direct a portion of the royalties from these Outer Continental Shelf lands for the restoration of lands from the Gulf of Mexico producing States, then those revenues should be sufficient to increase the amount dedicated from these leases to the 46 other States of this Nation.

Again, I rise in support of S. 3711 and will vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, during this hot, sultry, high-gas-price summer, I urge the American people to take a minute to observe the U.S. Senate. Take just a few minutes from the daily challenges of coping with the kids, driving them from camp to soccer grounds, going to church, worrying about how to cobble together enough money to manage even a brief family outing, and watching nightly news coverage of the Middle East imploding to focus, just briefly, on what is happening, or rather not happening, on this Senate floor.

Instead of working to pass necessary legislation like the 11 remaining appropriations bills, which are now jammed up and waiting for movement like the cars in a typical rush hour on the Washington beltway, we are engaged in yet another leadership-driven message dance. These fandangoes feature bills which are meant to drive home political points to the unsuspecting American voter.

The latest entry in this catalog of message bills is S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy bill, a bill cobbled together by the majority and then presented to the full Senate to vote on without opportunity for amendments.

To anyone in these United States who is tempted to swallow the line that this sham bill now on the Senate floor is a solution to high petroleum and natural gas prices, I say think again. Desperate politicians eager to invent a vote which can serve as the 30-second add solution to the hot-button issue of high energy prices are out to hoodwink the public again, this time with this very bad idea.

Well, this Senator is very weary of message bills that lie to the public. Here is the plain truth about the U.S. supply of oil and the world supply of oil. We are running out, and we will reach that peak in oil in the not-too-distant future. U.S. production peaked 30 years ago. That is why the U.S. imports two thirds of the oil it consumes, and that consumption is about 20 million barrels per day. As far as U.S. supplies go, if the United States were, for some reason, suddenly dependent on only our own supply, we would hit empty very soon. That is the cold, hard truth. There isn't much oil left to pump in these United States, and pumping it will not make one iota of difference in the price of gasoline, because oil is a global commodity and is bought and sold on the international market.

After the oil is gone, the fuel of choice is another finite source natural gas. Who leads the race in that new energy game? None other than nations such as Russia and Iran, because they are the top two global natural gas reserve holders. If that makes you sleep well at night or suggests to you the emergence of lower energy prices, I would have to say I beg to disagree.

The only course of action which will lead to lower, more reliable, more secure energy and energy prices is a strong national commitment to investing in greater energy efficiency and developing alternate energy sources—and the sooner we get started the better.

The President likes to say that the solution to high gas prices is to build more refineries. I do not disagree that it would be useful to build more refineries because we have not built any since the 1970s. However that is not a short-term solution, nor is it a simplistic, long-term solution to high gas prices. It takes too long to build refineries for refineries to be a short-term solution. And we are running out of oil, so refineries cannot be a long-term solution.

The solution, of course, is the development of a variety of alternative energy sources. Crude oil currently costs something like $74 per barrel, and that price will certainly go up. Nuclear power plants can be hazardous, especially in this age of terrorism. Clean coal liquefaction technologies are promising because the good ole U.S. of A. is by far the global leader in proven coal supplies. Remember that half of all U.S. electric power comes from coal. But, there has been no real robust commitment to clean coal technologies, industrial gasification, and coal liquefaction by this administration.

Yet this bill—this message bill—this bumper sticker solution to American distress over high gas prices is a pathetic attempt to foist a fake promise upon the people, which the American people ought not swallow. It will do little or nothing to bring down gas prices or natural gas costs. It is also just very bad legislation. Let me tell you why.

This proposed offshore drilling in Florida waters is not worth the environmental risk. The total amount of oil which could be extracted from this new drilling will equal around 55 days of American consumption at current usage rates. Consider also the time it will take to develop this region—to deploy the rigs, pump, refine, and transport these products, and anyone who cogitates for just 30 seconds will clearly see that this drilling will do nothing to bring down gas prices in the near term.

Furthermore, the generous revenue sharing plan aimed at buying the votes of coastal State Senators could well have an impact on our future Federal funding needs. The robust payments to just four Gulf-producing States which will not be offset by the oil and gas generated by this new offshore drilling could cause holes in the Federal treasury which would impact programs that would benefit States like West Virginia.

This bill is a bad deal for State and 45 other States, which can offer alternative fuels to blunt our dependence on oil. We are not allowed to consider amendments to this bill. A yes vote for this bill does nothing to help coal, ethanol, solar, and wind technologies because it propagates the myth of continued dependence on oil and gas. A yes vote lies to the American public, because it says Joe Citizen can continue economically drive a gas powered automobile if only we drill a few more holes in the fragile gulf coast shoreline.

A yes vote on this bill says to the American public, don't bother to increase energy efficiency or produce alternative fuels. It says don't push the powers that be to stop gauging and start producing transportation that does not depend on a dwindling supply of scarce and ever increasingly expensive oil.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 5 p.m. is equally divided. The minority side currently has 53 minutes, and the majority side has 25 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if somebody comes, I will be willing to enter into a different consent agreement, if somebody comes seeking the floor on the other side, but I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business but with the time to be running as it normally would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an amendment I would have offered to the energy legislation that is before us. It should be my right as a Senator to offer such an amendment. It should be the right of any Senator to offer an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate.

Unfortunately, because of parliamentary maneuvering by the majority leader, Senators, including myself, will not be able to offer our amendments to this offshore drilling legislation. In the Senate vernacular, ''the tree has been filled'' with such gimmicks as changing the bill's effective date and then changing it back again. Those gimmicks restrict this legislation to being nothing more than a special interest boondoggle for the oil and natural gas industries, and for four Gulf States that would, for the first time, get a direct cut of that bonanza.

It is one thing to limit debate on a measure, as the Senate has chosen to do in this instance, and even though I voted against cloture, I can understand the desire of over 60 colleagues to proceed; but to prevent additional amendments related to our country's domestic energy production and consumption is uncalled for and unwise.

It makes a mockery of the Republican leader's promise on May 1 of this year, 3 months ago, that the Senate would vote this year on comprehensive energy legislation. His exact words were:

> We [the Republican leadership] have presented a strong package that will give consumers relief at the pump and help bring down the high cost of gas. I'm hopeful that we will vote on this package in the coming days.

As we all know, the remaining days in this Congress are coming and going. In fact, they are almost gone. If the Senate were going to take up the Republican energy package or a Democratic energy package or, best of all, an American energy package, this would seem to be our chance to do so. Instead, we get a special interest boondoggle, and we are not even allowed to offer amendments that could make it the comprehensive energy bill the Republican leader promised us.

This bill's authors have entitled it the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006, but that title says our future energy security is more of the same—more of the same energy sources at ever higher prices, with ever greater profits to the major oil and gas companies, and, for the first time, with 37.5 percent of the public revenues going to only four Gulf States. Under this legislation, 50 percent of the public revenues would go into the Federal Treasury, 12.5 percent would go to all of the States under the LAWCON program. As I said before, 37.5 percent would go directly to the four States—Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Mississippi.

This virtually unprecedented arrangement is a great deal for those four States. No wonder their eight Senators strongly support it. I have to begrudgingly congratulate the Senators from Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Mississippi. They have done an excellent job in writing this legislation to benefit their States. So I certainly understand their support for this brand of revenuesharing.

What I don't understand is why the other 92 of us would agree to it. The offshore waters of the Gulf Coast belong to all Americans, as do the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Great Lakes, and other national resources. This is a terrible precedent—to allow a few States to benefit at the expense of the rest simply because of their proximity to a national resource—not their ownership of it, just the proximity to it. If Congress opens this door, watch for the stampede of parochial claims for a cut of every other Federal natural resource.

Also sadly lacking from this bill is any kind of windfall profits tax on the major oil companies that are its principal beneficiaries. It is appalling that, at a time when Americans are paying $3 or more a gallon for gasoline and the oil giants such as ExxonMobil are enjoying record high profits, there is no attempt in this bill to recapture any of those profits for the American people or for the public purposes that would benefit them.

This legislation opens a public resource, gift wraps most of its value, and hand delivers billions and billions of those dollars to special corporate interests at the expense of the American citizens in 46 States. How the elected representatives of those 46 States could allow this to happen is astonishing. I hope the residents of those States will demand some answers. Those citizens should also ask why nothing in this so-called Energy Security Act provides any energy security at all. At best, it will provide a relatively small additional supply of oil and natural gas for a relatively few years starting, at best, several years from now, supplies for which consumers will likely pay even higher prices than they are today.

Someone once said the definition of insanity is to keep doing the same thing and hope for a different result. If so, this continuation of a national energy strategy is insane. We cannot produce our way to energy self-sufficiency when consumers have no alternatives to those traditional energy sources. This bill does nothing to provide Americans with any of those energy alternatives—not today, tomorrow, or 10 years from now. None of us in the Senate are being given the opportunity to offer any of those alternatives to this bill.

Mr. President, I have introduced legislation that would encourage the additional production and use of biofuels, specifically ethanol and biodiesel. My amendment to this bill would help give more Americans a choice every time they fill up their fuel tanks between gasoline or diesel and lower cost alternatives, such as E–85, comprised of 85 percent ethanol, biodiesel made out of soybeans, and other agricultural commodities, and even out of animal renderings.

These energy sources are not buried under miles of water or ocean floor located miles and miles away. They are right in our agricultural States. They are renewable every year. They are cleaner burning than traditional fossil-based fuels and they provide additional boosts to farmers in rural communities around the Nation, where local economies depend upon a healthy agricultural economy. They boost the market prices in the marketplace for those commodities, meaning they lower taxpayer subsidies. It is a win-win-win for all Americans; yet we are not allowed to offer these additional kinds of incentives and expansion of these and other energy fuels, conservation, and other ways that we can truly enhance our energy security.

For those reasons, I oppose this legislation and, most of all, I oppose the tactics used in this bill to prevent it from becoming what it should be, what the American people need and certainly deserve, which is comprehensive energy legislation that will provide real energy security for our country, lower cost energy supplies now and for years to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to congratulate the Senate in advance of a vote at 5 o'clock which is going to demonstrate the Senate at its best—a bipartisan accomplishment of extraordinary importance, particularly to the area of the country that the occupant of the chair represents. I know Senator VITTER has for many years wanted to achieve something related to the gulf coast deepwater exploration issue that would benefit his State. We are on the verge of having that remarkable success.

Particular kudos to Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the Energy Committee, who was absolutely indispensable in pulling together the various elements that did come together for this bipartisan accomplishment; Senator MEL MARTINEZ of Florida, who protected the coastline of his State while still helping to lead the way in a direction that allowed this compromise to go forward; Senator LANDRIEU for delivering a significant number of Democrats who were, of course, needed in order to make this a bipartisan proposal; and to all of the Gulf Coast States as well as all the other Senators whose States will indeed benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

As I said, this is the Senate at its finest. I congratulate all those who have been integral parts of bringing about this important bipartisan achievement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this truly is going to be quite a vote in just a few minutes as the Senate has decided to have a vote at 5 o'clock on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Independence Act.

Mr. President, you have been particularly helpful in putting this bill together, along with other gulf coast Senators.

I wanted to come to the floor to thank so many people who have helped to make this bill possible. It was many months in the working, many, many negotiations and meetings that went on to produce a bill that is not only going to be of extraordinary help to the great State of Louisiana and to all the Gulf Coast States as we try to restore our coastline, restore our marshlands, stop the erosion, and build the levees and the floodgates that are so imperative and critical to the protection of our people, our communities, large and small, but it is also a bill that is so important for this Nation as we seek to increase the supply of oil and gas produced in this country so we don't have to rely on oil and gas coming in from unfriendly and unstable places.

It took a tremendous amount of work for this bill to be put together. I begin by thanking particularly Senator DOMENICI who, as the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for many years, has served as ranking member for some of those years, has led on the issue of energy in almost every aspect, trying to help us increase supply, diversify supply, and come together on conservation measures that are important for the Nation.

I also thank Senator HARRY REID, the Democratic leader. Without his support, we would not have been able to get the Democratic votes necessary to join in a bipartisan spirit to provide revenuesharing for the Gulf Coast States, to establish for the first time a real conservation royalty for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and in a great way contribute to the reduction of the deficit by encouraging production where we can get new production, therefore generating more revenues for the Nation. Senator HARRY REID is from Nevada, a State that has produced great natural resources for the country. He understands the balance in this policy.

I thank Senator BILL FRIST and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL. Senator DOMENICI is in the Senate now. He is scheduled to speak, so I will wrap up. I thank Senator BILL FRIST and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL for helping to pull the Senate together to keep us working on this good, balanced compromise.

I thank the Senators from the gulf coast, of course, including the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Louisiana, as well as Senator LOTT, Senator SHELBY, Senator SESSIONS, Senator COCHRAN, Senator HUTCHISON, and Senator CORNYN. None of this would have been possible without the gulf coast Senators coming together and agreeing how to share the money, how to proceed. I thank the Senators from Florida, Senator MARTINEZ and Senator NELSON, as well.

There is a list of staffers I will have printed in the RECORD, starting with my own staff, Janet Woodka, legislative director; Jason Matthews; Tom Michels; Elizabeth Craddock; and Ron Faucheaux; a list of staffers representing all the Senators who were instrumental in the passing of this bill. I thank them very much, particularly Frank Macciorola with Senator DOMENICI and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee who led this effort with Bruce Evans. It would not have been possible without the help of Libby Jarvis from Senator FRIST's office.

The staff have put in the long hours and I thank them for all of their hard work. That staff includes: Chris Miller, Senator REID; Frank Macciorola, Senator DOMENICI, Senate Energy Committee; Bruce Evans, Senator DOMENICI, Senate Energy Committee; Libby Jarvis, Senator FRIST; Kyle Simmons and Malloy McDaniel, Senator MCCONNELL; Jim Sartucii and Annie Estrada, Senator LOTT; Garrett Graves, Senator VITTER; Ryan Welch, Senator SHELBY; Marie Thomas, Senator COCHRAN; Jamie Moore, Senator HUTCHISON; Spencer Chambers, Senator CORNYN; Dan Shapiro and Bridget Walsh, Senator BILL NELSON; Brydon Ross, Senator MARTINEZ; Stephen Boyd, Senator SESSIONS.

I also thank all of my staff—they have all worked hard over the years—and in particular, my energy team: Tom Michels, Elizabeth Craddock, Janet Woodka, Jason Matthews, and Ron Faucheaux.

Any my former staff-who have laid the groundwork and built this issue up over the past 10 years to get us to where we are today—most notably Jason Schendle, who has been a tremendous resource and advocate, Kathleen Strottman, Dionne Thomas, and Neil Naraine.

Finally, I thank Senator J. Bennett Johnston, whose seat I now occupy and my great friend, Senator John Breaux.

I see Senator DOMENICI in the Senate. I thank him for his extraordinary leadership in helping the Nation break through on new drilling for the first time in many decades.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for her kind remarks and for her great support in this effort.

The junior Senator from Louisiana, who is the Presiding Officer, I thank now for the support and dedicated commitment to what we are doing. It is not only for the State of Louisiana, but for all the coastal States surrounding Louisiana. It is very important for the United States. I commend the Senator for his participation.

I would like to thank a Senator who was vital. He was courageous. He stepped forward, as Senators from Florida have not been used to doing. That was Senator MEL MARTINEZ, who came forward and said: I would like to work with you. And he ended up striking a balance for his people of Florida and for America. And he, along with the others we have mentioned, got us going.

It has been a pleasure taking this job on and to end up tonight, 10 minutes before the vote, with the full appreciation on the part of scores of Senators that we are about to do something very positive, very important. For a change, very few Senators will still have to say no. Most of the time it is hard to get 60 votes for cloture. Many times it is hard to get that 51 needed for a simple majority.

Over the weeks, and finally over the days, the point has come across to the bipartisan Senators in this Senate, this bill is welcome news for the consumers of the United States, for homeowners, families, people who work in all kinds of manufacturing businesses, chemical businesses, plastic businesses, all kinds of activities related to natural gas. Of course, there is oil involved, too, but that is secondary to the natural gas which is also involved.

It has finally dawned on everyone here, we own a piece of property. It has USA stamped all over it. It is off the coast of Florida, off the coast of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, out there in the gulf. There are roughly 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas owned by us, much of which is ready to be drilled, much of which can be drilled during the next decade. There is enough gas for 6 million houses for 15 years, to quantify it. That does not mean that is where it is going. It will be added to the availability of the supply and 1.250 billion barrels of oil. It has finally dawned on everyone. Now we will get their vote. That is all on our property. We have been sitting idly by, year after year, saying no, no, no, because we want a moratorium to protect something that needed no protection, the shoreline of Florida. I don't mean that literally. I mean we can drill on this property as provided in this bill with no damage yet, after we have sat here year after year saying no.

It does not happen very often, I say to my distinguished assistant Republican leader, but at the very time and day that we are voting, the best evidence you can get is right on the streets, in the homes, and on the television news for the American people to hear, see, and, incidentally, feel: We have had these enormous heat waves and the use of natural gas has jumped so much. That creates a scarcity; that creates an increase in price. Yesterday, the day before this vote, the price increased 11 percent in 1 day. Right now, it is $8.05 per million Btus. That price is four times higher than it was 6 years ago. That is incredible, but it is true.

Fellow Senators, when you vote tonight to add 1.2 million barrels, if this went to the President and got signed, we instantly add it to the ready reserves of America for crude oil waiting to be drilled and put into the system. Members would be voting to instantly add to our ready reserves of natural gas which we could start getting on the market in the not too distant future, almost 6 trillion cubic feet.

We have a crisis right in front of our nose and we have a partial cure right in front of our nose, but this time we decided we would go ahead and do it, not continue to say no and to worry ourselves to death over what could happen. This could happen, that could happen, do we need it, should we do it. That is what has happened in the United States recently when we are trying to make energy decisions. We do not want to recognize that there is a bit of a risk, but you have to take a bit of a risk for a big benefit. In this case, it is a very minimum risk and a very big benefit.

I am particularly pleased in this bill we are reinvesting in our environment. For decades, our coastal States have produced much of the oil and gas which the Nation consumes. They no longer sit back and go along with leasing without compensation needed for their infrastructure, the coastal environment. It is so critical to our domestic energy survival. We have changed direction and said ''share it with them.'' That is a good idea, a new precedent which we need not be embarrassed about.

We also have said we want to share some of this wealth with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a very good national program. We have not done that before. That, too, is good precedent, good ground to break, and sets us on a good path.

For those who worry, again, about that and about sharing with the States, I regret if that concerns them so much they will not vote for this bill. I am very sorry about that. In this case, the benefits so outweigh the risks of changing policy or changing direction that we should have a stampede, not a vote, when it comes time to count.

I am not going to do justice to all those who helped me by mentioning them all because I will not get to it. That is probably my mistake. I thank my friend and colleague from the State of Louisiana who is here in the Senate. She started working with me early as a member of the committee. Obviously, Senator VITTER, also, from Louisiana, an early participant. I thank him greatly for his efforts, as well as all the coastal State Senators. I also thank the distinguished leaders on our side who encouraged and urged passing. In fact, I would say about my good friend from Kentucky, I think he thought more about my proceeding to get this done than I did a few weeks ago. He kept saying it was a great day, get along with it, PETE, let's do it. So we are doing it.

This is a good bill. It took a little effort. It took a little time. Nonetheless, compared with other bills around here these days, it is not going to go to the graveyard. It is not going to die because Senators were able to talk the Senate into voting again to delay or kill a bill. They have not been able to do that on this bill. We are grateful.

The American people ought to know that even with the hurdle of 60 votes which was required because of filibuster threats on this bill, we prevailed. We have learned also that when we vote tonight, I think we only need 51 votes for a change. That is a very good sign. Finally, we are at a point where a 51-vote majority would win. We thought it was that way all the time, but it wasn't. Finally, after all the hurdles, we will have many more than that, but this is going to pass.

For those who are watching, we are at a point where that old-fashioned majority would be enough. We learned about the majority in school. It has been thrown out the window because there is so much politicking going on. Every vote is 60 votes around here. In the next few years we will have a few more of those, Mr. Leader, with the tax bill, and it will be 60 votes because someone is screaming filibuster.

I used to think filibusters were great when I first came to the Senate. Then I almost changed and said: Throw them away. I don't know where I am now. I do know I am for using part of the Budget Act to get around filibusters.

Mr. FRIST. Are you filibustering me right now?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am through. It will be a nice evening. I am going to go back and sit down. Thank you, Senator FRIST, for helping me. I want you to thank me for letting you have a happy day for a change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I do thank my distinguished colleague, who about 2 months ago said, we can do this, we can do it for the American people. It was at a time where it looked as though this Senate could not come together to address one of the more fundamental issues that the taxpayer, the American consumer, sees every day; that is, the price of gas, the price of consumer products that go up because of the natural gas required to make that product.

We have addressed it in a bipartisan way: Senator DOMENICI, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator MARTINEZ, Senator VITTER—the Gulf State Senators—my distinguished colleague, the assistant majority leader, who was there every second of the way, through meeting after meeting, as we worked through the many, many details in what was really pioneering work in many ways, opening up the deep sea energy exploration, with the sharing of revenues coming in and what the appropriate amount should be. So I do thank all of them.

I have to come back to Senator DOMENICI and him just looking them in the eye and saying: It can get done. I know elections are coming, and I know there is partisanship, people want to slow the place down, but we are going to do it. To have it done means a lot.

''The increase in energy prices is clearly making the economy worse off. . . .'' If oil prices continue to rise, there will be ''significant consequences'' for the economy. That was the testimony delivered by Federal Reserve Bank Chairman Ben Bernanke earlier this month before the House Committee on Financial Services.

When I look at the evidence, I cannot help but agree. Right now, Americans are paying, on average, $3 per gallon for regular unleaded gasoline. Right now, 60 percent of the oil we consume comes from overseas, from foreign countries. Right now, we are on track to a future where the demand for petroleum more than doubles our supply here at home—more than doubles our domestic supply. And right now, the price of natural gas for American consumers and industries, as of this morning, is $8.05 per million Btu, and that is six times as much as the price in countries competing for American jobs.

What do all these numbers mean? We hear the numbers a lot on the floor. What it translates into for that average consumer, that typical consumer, is higher cooling bills for their homes, higher heating bills in other seasons, higher prices for products made with natural gas, and higher prices for farm produce.

They mean manufacturing jobs lost in America. When U.S. companies have to pay more for the energy they need, it makes it harder for them to compete in the global marketplace, and it results in jobs being lost to overseas, facilities being shipped overseas. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that more than 3.1 million high-wage manufacturing jobs have been lost just in the last 6 years, largely as a result of high energy prices. Of more than 120 world-scale chemical plants under construction across the globe, only one is being built here at home.

The high cost of natural gas is hurting farmers. Over the last 3 days, over the weekend, I spent a lot of time with farmers, actually, in North Carolina, in Tennessee, and in Iowa, and the No. 1 issue from the farmers was the high price of fertilizer because of the natural gas to make that fertilizer.

It is hurting the forest and paper products industry. Mr. President, 267 mills have closed and 189,000 jobs have been lost since this runup in natural gas prices over the last 6 years.

You put all those numbers together, and they point to a clear conclusion. It is the exact same conclusion of Ben Bernanke, Chairman Bernanke: America is dangerously dependent on foreign sources of energy, and it is hurting our economy. It hurts our consumers.

Last year, Congress began to address this problem, under the leadership of PETE DOMENICI, once again, by passing a comprehensive energy bill. I do not think anybody realized at the time how comprehensive that bill was, how important, how timely that bill was. Again and again it had been obstructed from the other side of the aisle, but under his leadership we passed it.

What has happened just in the last 12 months? Because of that Energy bill, 27 new ethanol plants have broken ground, and 150 more are in the works. Because of that Energy bill, the amount of ethanol and biodiesel we use in our gasoline will more than double over the next 6 years, and that will save 80,000 barrels a day. Because of the Energy bill we passed, 401 new E–85 pumps have been installed. Because of that Energy bill we passed a year ago, the nuclear industry is planning to build 25 new reactors in the United States, and that is enough to boost 15 million households with power with that clean, emission-free energy. Because of that Energy bill, 120 clean-coal facilities are in the planning stages—enough to replace 2 million barrels of oil a day by the year 2025. And because of the Energy bill—as I was flying across the country, I looked out and saw those windmills out there—wind power, solar power, and hydrogen fuel cells all got a shot in the arm.

The Energy bill we passed a year ago was only part of the solution. The bill we will pass here shortly is that next critical step. And there will be other steps, as so many of my colleagues who have said ''I have a great idea'' have demonstrated. But the bill we have today will reduce our dependence on foreign oil and natural gas by opening 8 million acres in the gulf for domestic exploration. The area opened under this bill is estimated to contain 1.26 billion barrels of oil and over 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. As has been said, that is roughly the same amount of oil as the proven reserves of Wyoming and Oklahoma combined, and more than six times our current imports of liquefied natural gas each year.

This bill will substantially reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil and gas. It increases our energy independence. It strengthens our national security. And it helps to reduce the cost of living for every American consumer. It will have a direct impact on the prices consumers pay at the pump and on their power bills each month.

Mr. President, now more than ever America needs American energy. That is what the bill before us does. It brings more American energy to American consumers.

Let me just close once again in thanking Chairman DOMENICI, Senator MARTINEZ, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator VITTER—all the Senators from the gulf coast—and, as I said earlier, especially the assistant majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his leadership.

I know this bill will receive broad bipartisan support. And when we begin that vote here shortly, it will move us one step closer to lowering energy prices for all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4713 AND 4714, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments are withdrawn.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Burns	Coburn
Allard	Burr	Cochran
Allen	Carper	Coleman
Bennett	Chafee	Collins
Bond	Chambliss	Conrad
Brownback	Clinton	Cornyn

Craig	Isakson	Rockefeller
Crapo	Johnson	Salazar
DeMint	Kohl	Santorum
DeWine	Kyl	Schumer
Dole	Landrieu	Sessions
Domenici	Levin	Shelby
Dorgan	Lincoln	Smith
Ensign	Lott	Specter
Enzi	Lugar	Stabenow
Frist	Martinez	Stevens
Graham	McCain	Sununu
Grassley	McConnell	Talent
Gregg	Murkowski	Thomas
Hagel	Nelson (FL)	Thune
Hatch	Nelson (NE)	Vitter
Hutchison	Pryor	Voinovich
Inhofe	Reid	Warner
Inouye	Roberts	

NAYS—25

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Obama
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kennedy	Snowe
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dayton	Leahy	
Dodd	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—4

Baucus	Kerry
Bunning	Lieberman

The bill (S. 3711) was passed, as follows:

S. 3711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) 181 AREA.—The term ''181 Area'' means the area identified in map 15, page 58, of the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 1997–2002, dated August 1996, of the Minerals Management Service, available in the Office of the Director of the Minerals Management Service, excluding the area offered in OCS Lease Sale 181, held on December 5, 2001.

(2) 181 SOUTH AREA.—The term ''181 South Area'' means any area—

(A) located—

(i) south of the 181 Area;

(ii) west of the Military Mission Line; and

(iii) in the Central Planning Area;

(B) excluded from the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 1997–2002, dated August 1996, of the Minerals Management Service; and

(C) included in the areas considered for oil and gas leasing, as identified in map 8, page 37 of the document entitled ''Draft Proposed Program Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2007–2012'', dated February 2006.

(3) BONUS OR ROYALTY CREDIT.—The term ''bonus or royalty credit'' means a legal instrument or other written documentation, or an entry in an account managed by the Secretary, that may be used in lieu of any other monetary payment for—

(A) a bonus bid for a lease on the outer Continental Shelf; or

(B) a royalty due on oil or gas production from any lease located on the outer Continental Shelf.

(4) CENTRAL PLANNING AREA.—The term ''Central Planning Area'' means the Central Gulf of Mexico Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf, as designated in the document entitled ''Draft Proposed Program Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2007–2012'', dated February 2006.

(5) EASTERN PLANNING AREA.—The term ''Eastern Planning Area'' means the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf, as designated in the document entitled ''Draft Proposed Program Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2007–2012'', dated February 2006.

(6) 2002–2007 PLANNING AREA.—The term ''2002–2007 planning area'' means any area—

(A) located in—

(i) the Eastern Planning Area, as designated in the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2002–2007, dated April 2002, of the Minerals Management Service;

(ii) the Central Planning Area, as designated in the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2002–2007, dated April 2002, of the Minerals Management Service; or

(iii) the Western Planning Area, as designated in the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2002–2007, dated April 2002, of the Minerals Management Service; and

(B) not located in—

(i) an area in which no funds may be expended to conduct offshore preleasing, leasing, and related activities under sections 104 through 106 of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–54; 119 Stat. 521) (as in effect on August 2, 2005);

(ii) an area withdrawn from leasing under the ''Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf from Leasing Disposition'', from 34 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1111, dated June 12, 1998; or

(iii) the 181 Area or 181 South Area.

(7) GULF PRODUCING STATE.—The term ''Gulf producing State'' means each of the States of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

(8) MILITARY MISSION LINE.—The term ''Military Mission Line'' means the north-south line at 86°41′ W. longitude.

(9) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues'' means—

(i) in the case of each of fiscal years 2007 through 2016, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act for—

(I) areas in the 181 Area located in the Eastern Planning Area; and

(II) the 181 South Area; and

(ii) in the case of fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States received on or after October 1, 2016, from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act for—

(I) the 181 Area;

(II) the 181 South Area; and

(III) the 2002–2007 planning area.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues'' does not include—

(i) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other than royalties, civil penalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold; or

(ii) revenues generated from leases subject to section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(10) COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISION.—The term ''coastal political subdivision'' means a political subdivision of a Gulf producing State any part of which political subdivision is—

(A) within the coastal zone (as defined in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453)) of the Gulf producing State as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) not more than 200 nautical miles from the geographic center of any leased tract.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING IN 181 AREA AND 181 SOUTH AREA OF GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) 181 AREA LEASE SALE.—Except as provided in section 4, the Secretary shall offer the 181 Area for oil and gas leasing pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) as soon as practicable, but not later than 1 year, after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) 181 SOUTH AREA LEASE SALE.—The Secretary shall offer the 181 South Area for oil and gas leasing pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LEASING PROGRAM.—The 181 Area and 181 South Area shall be offered for lease under this section notwithstanding the omission of the 181 Area or the 181 South Area from any outer Continental Shelf leasing program under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 105 of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–54; 119 Stat. 522) is amended by inserting ''(other than the 181 South Area (as defined in section 2 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006))'' after ''lands located outside Sale 181''.

SEC. 4. MORATORIUM ON OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on June 30, 2022, the Secretary shall not offer for leasing, preleasing, or any related activity—

(1) any area east of the Military Mission Line in the Gulf of Mexico;

(2) any area in the Eastern Planning Area that is within 125 miles of the coastline of the State of Florida; or

(3) any area in the Central Planning Area that is—

(A) within—

(i) the 181 Area; and

(ii) 100 miles of the coastline of the State of Florida; or

(B)(i) outside the 181 Area;

(ii) east of the western edge of the Pensacola Official Protraction Diagram (UTM X coordinate 1,393,920 (NAD 27 feet)); and

(iii) within 100 miles of the coastline of the State of Florida.

(b) MILITARY MISSION LINE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the United States reserves the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, national defense areas on the outer Continental Shelf pursuant to section 12(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(d)).

(c) EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall permit any person that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, has entered into an oil or gas lease with the Secretary in any area described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) to exchange the lease for a bonus or royalty credit that may only be used in the Gulf of Mexico.

(2) VALUATION OF EXISTING LEASE.—The amount of the bonus or royalty credit for a lease to be exchanged shall be equal to—

(A) the amount of the bonus bid; and

(B) any rental paid for the lease as of the date the lessee notifies the Secretary of the decision to exchange the lease.

(3) REVENUE DISTRIBUTION.—No bonus or royalty credit may be used under this subsection in lieu of any payment due under, or to acquire any interest in, a lease subject to the revenue distribution provisions of section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(4) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that shall provide a process for—

(A) notification to the Secretary of a decision to exchange an eligible lease;

(B) issuance of bonus or royalty credits in exchange for relinquishment of the existing lease;

(C) transfer of the bonus or royalty credit to any other person; and

(D) determining the proper allocation of bonus or royalty credits to each lease interest owner.

SEC. 5. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002–2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to the other provisions of this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–8), which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 2 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–5).

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG GULF PRODUCING STATES AND COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

(1) ALLOCATION AMONG GULF PRODUCING STATES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2016.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2016, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) shall be allocated to each Gulf producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Gulf producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a Gulf producing State each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(2) ALLOCATION AMONG GULF PRODUCING STATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017 AND THEREAFTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), effective for fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(i) the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the 181 Area or the 181 South Area shall be allocated to each Gulf producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Gulf producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract; and

(ii) the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the 2002–2007 planning area shall be allocated to each Gulf producing State in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Gulf producing State that is closest to the geographic center of each historical lease site and the geographic center of the historical lease site, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a Gulf producing State each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(C) HISTORICAL LEASE SITES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the historical lease sites in the 2002–2007 planning area shall include all leases entered into by the Secretary for an area in the Gulf of Mexico during the period beginning on October 1, 1982 (or an earlier date if practicable, as determined by the Secretary), and ending on December 31, 2015.

(ii) ADJUSTMENT.—Effective January 1, 2022, and every 5 years thereafter, the ending date described in clause (i) shall be extended for an additional 5 calendar years.

(3) PAYMENTS TO COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay 20 percent of the allocable share of each Gulf producing State, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2), to the coastal political subdivisions of the Gulf producing State.

(B) ALLOCATION.—The amount paid by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions shall be allocated to each coastal political subdivision in accordance with subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of section 31(b)(4) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356a(b)(4)).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) AUTHORIZED USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), each Gulf producing State and coastal political subdivision shall use all amounts received under subsection (b) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, only for 1 or more of the following purposes:

(A) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection, including conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, and infrastructure directly affected by coastal wetland losses.

(B) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.

(C) Implementation of a federally-approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation management plan.

(D) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects.

(E) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this section.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 3 percent of amounts received by a Gulf producing State or coastal political subdivision under subsection (b) may be used for the purposes described in paragraph (1)(E).

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 et seq.); or

(C) any other provision of law.

(f) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed $500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2055.

(2) EXPENDITURES.—For the purpose of paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from any area in the 181 Area in the Eastern Planning Area and the 181 South Area.

(3) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.—If paragraph (1) limits the amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenue that would be paid under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(2)—

(A) the Secretary shall reduce the amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenue provided to each recipient on a pro rata basis; and

(B) any remainder of the qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I was unfortunately not present to vote on final passage of S. 3711, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been present, I would have voted no on both the July 31 vote on the motion to invoke cloture as well as today's vote on final passage of the bill.

This legislation not only fails to address our energy problems, it raids the Federal Treasury and threatens our coastal economies and ecosystems. Opening more of our coastlines to drilling is clearly not the answer to our energy problems, especially given that 80 percent of offshore oil and gas resources are already open to drilling, and oil companies currently hold more than 4,000 untapped leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

Instead of despoiling our shores and perpetuating our dependence on oil, I believe Congress should pursue more environmentally friendly solutions, including investments in efficiency, biofuels, and increased use of renewable energy such as wind and solar power.

Unfortunately, rather than using American ingenuity to advance a new energy future that benefits both the economy and the environment, S. 3711 continues to promote failed policies of the past. It opens 8 million acres of Florida's gulf coast waters to offshore drilling rigs, including more than 6 million acres that are currently protected by the bipartisan moratorium on offshore drilling that has been in place for 25 years. S. 3711 also diverts tens of billions of dollars in offshore drilling revenues from the Federal Treasury and gives the money to just four States.

Furthermore, passing S. 3711 paves the way for a conference with H.R. 4761, the even more harmful House-passed bill that lifts the moratorium on all offshore drilling, including my home State, Massachusetts.

For our coasts, our environment, and our economy, I oppose S. 3711, and instead support real solutions to our energy problems.●

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 532, H.R. 5631. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to as original text for the purpose of further amendment, with no points of order waived by virtue of this agreement. I further ask that consideration of the bill be for debate only during today's session.

Further, I ask that it not be in order to file a cloture motion on this bill prior to the adjournment for August. This is the DOD appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5631) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $29,080,473,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $23,186,011,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $9,246,696,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,940,686,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,304,247,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,760,676,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $535,438,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent